

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



39.

553.

]

THE PROTESTANT'S ARMORY.

PRINTED BY
L. AND G. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.

THE PROTESTANT'S ARMORY;

BEING

**A COLLECTION OF EXTRACTS FROM
VARIOUS WRITERS**

ON THE

CHURCH OF ROME,

**CHIEFLY DESIGNED TO SHOW ITS APOSTATE, IDOLATROUS,
AND ANTICHRISTIAN CHARACTER.**

COMPILED BY

A LAY MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.



**PUBLISHED BY R. B. SEELEY AND W. BURNSIDE;
AND SOLD BY L. AND G. SEELEY,
FLEET STREET, LONDON.
MDCCCXXXIX.**

P R E F A C E.

IN presenting a work to the public it is usual to prefix a few remarks explanatory of its object. The design of the present volume, as its title imports, is, to exhibit at one view the sentiments of different Authors on the apostate, idolatrous, and antichristian character of the Church of Rome.

The Compiler has often been perplexed by the discrepancy of opinion which exists among learned men, respecting the real character of that church; some regarding her as a true, apostolic, and Christian church, “holding the head,” and retaining the fundamentals of Christianity; whilst others, denying this, confidently assert that she has by her delinquencies

forfeited all claim to the title of a true and living branch of the Christian Church. He has taken some pains to inform his mind upon this subject; the result of the inquiry is, a deep-felt conviction that they who entertain the latter opinion have revelation and reason on their side. He believes that the religion of the Church of Rome is a *false* religion, and a base *counterfeit* of Christianity; that Popery is not, as many imagine, a system of truth overlaid with error; but, a system of error;—deep, foul, and flagitious, artfully concealed under a thin incrustation of truth. Like the wolf in sheep's clothing, its object is to deceive, in order that it may destroy. It is a characteristic feature of real excellence to improve upon acquaintance, but there is something so intrinsically bad about Popery, that the more intimately we become acquainted with its genius, the more atrocious and diabolical it appears.

That pious and learned men should be so deluded as to call such a “mystery of iniquity” a true branch of the Christian Church, may well excite our sorrow and surprise. Nothing can account for this but an overweening attachment to some favourite hypothesis, and when men have a theory to support, the infatuation of learning is, perhaps, quite as great, as the infatuation of ignorance or superstition.

It occurred to the Compiler that it might not be altogether an unprofitable employment of such leisure time as could be spared from the duties of a laborious profession, to collect and arrange such scattered passages as had made an impression upon his own mind, and led him to come to the following conclusion; namely, that the so-called Church of Rome is *an apostate, idolatrous, and anti-christian community; neither holding the Head, nor retaining the fundamentals of Christianity.*

May the Divine blessing attend this effort to exhibit Popery in its true colours. May Protestants in general be more on their guard against the insidious encroachments of this wily, restless adversary; and may the clergy of the Church of England in particular, instead of bestowing upon the Church of Rome the endearing appellation of a ‘venerated sister,’ be induced to hold her up in her real character, as the blood-stained harlot of the Apocalypse, whom “the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming.”

CONTENTS.

PART I.

	PAGE
ON THE APOSTATE CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME	1

PART II.

ON THE IDOLATROUS CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME	55
--	----

PART III.

ON THE ANTICHRISTIAN CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME	193
---	-----

PART IV.

MISCELLANEOUS SELECTIONS	289
APPENDIX	464

THE PROTESTANT'S ARMORY.

PART I.

ON THE APOSTATE CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"NOTHING IS APOSTASY IF IDOLATRY BE NOT."—BISHOP NEWTON.

EXTRACTS ON POPERY.

PART I.

ST. PAUL'S PROPHECY OF THE APOSTASY OF THE LATTER TIMES.

(1.)—ST. PAUL was a man of lively thought and strong imagination. None of the apostles had a warmer zeal for Christ and the Christian religion. He was, as he saith himself (2 Cor. xi. 23, 28, 29.) “ in labours more abundant ; ” he had “ the care of all the churches. ” “ Who is weak (said he) and I am not weak ? who is offended, and I burn not ? ” It was natural for such a mind to be deeply affected with the foresight of the great apostasy of Christians from the true Christian faith and worship, and to lament it, and to forewarn his disciples of it, as often as there was occasion. He made this apostasy one topic of his discourse to the Thessalonians, while he was yet with them, and afterwards in his second epistle to them, he gave them to understand that *the day of Christ was not at hand*, as they apprehended ; *for there should come the apostasy first* ; implying that it

should be both extensive and of long duration. He mentions this apostasy again in his first epistle to Timothy, and describes more particularly wherein it should consist, and at what time, and by what means it should be propagated and advanced in the world, 1 Timothy iv. 1—3. “ Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a hot iron ; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.” The passage perhaps may better be translated thus : *But the Spirit speaketh expressly.* He had been speaking before of *the mystery of godliness*, and now he proceeds to speak of *the mystery of iniquity* in opposition to it. *But the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to erroneous spirits and doctrines concerning demons. Through the hypocrisy of liars, having their consciences seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the believers and them who know the truth.* This translation will be justified by the following considerations, wherein it is proposed to show the true interpretation and exact completion of this prophecy. But this subject hath been so fully and learnedly discussed by the excellent Mr. Mede, that we must be greatly obliged to him in the course of this dissertation. The dress and clothing may be somewhat different, but the body and substance must be much the same ; and they must be referred to his works who are desirous of obtaining further satisfaction. . . .

The first thing to be considered is the apostasy here predicted : “ Some shall depart,” or rather *shall apostatize from the faith*. The apostle had predicted the same thing before to the Thessalonians, “ The day of Christ shall not come, except there come a falling away, or rather *the apostasy first*. In the original, the words are of the same import and derivation. . . . An *apostasy from the faith*, may be total or partial, either when we renounce the whole, or when we deny some principal and essential article of it. The writers of the New Testament frequently derive their language as well as their ideas from the Old ; and by considering what was accounted apostasy under the Mosaical œconomy, we may form the better notion of what it is under the Christian dispensation. It doth not appear that the Jews or Israelites ever totally renounced and abandoned the living and true God ; he never ceased altogether to be their God, or they to be his people ; but they revolted from their allegiance to God, when they worshipped him in an image, as in the golden calves, which was the sin and apostasy of Jeroboam ; and when they worshipped other gods besides him, as Baalim and the host of heaven, which was the sin and apostasy of Ahab and Manasseh, and for the same reason the idolatry of Ahaz is by the Greek interpreters called 2 Chron. xxix. 19. ἀποστασία αὐτοῦ, *his apostacy*, and it is said of him, xxviii. 19. that ἀπεστῆ ἀποστάσει ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, *he apostatized greatly from the Lord*.

Apostasy therefore, was idolatry in the Jewish church, and it is the same in the Christian. This argument may receive some illustration from a similar passage in St. Peter (2 Peter ii. 1.) “ There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall

bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." As there were false prophets among the children of Israel, who seduced them to idolatry, and the worshipping of other gods, besides the true God ; so there shall be false teachers among Christians, who by plausible pretences, and imperceptible degrees shall bring in the like damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them ; professing themselves to be his servants bought with a price, and yet denying him to be their Lord and Master, by applying to other lords and mediators. It is not any error, or every heresy, that is apostasy from the faith. It is a revolt in the principal and essential article, when we worship God by any image or representation, or when we worship other beings besides God, and pray unto other mediators besides " the one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." This is the very essence of Christian worship, to worship the one true God through the one true Christ ; and to worship any other God or any other mediator, is *apostasy* and rebellion against God and against Christ. It is as St. Paul saith, Col. ii. 19. *not holding the head*, but depending upon other heads : It is as St. Peter expresseth it, " denying the Lord that bought us," and serving other Lords : and the denial of such an essential part may as properly be called *apostasy*, as if we were to renounce the whole Christian faith and worship. It is renouncing them in effect, and not treating and regarding God as God, or Christ as Christ. Such is the nature of apostasy from the faith, &c.

It is plain that the great apostasy of the latter times was to prevail *through the hypocrisy of liars having their conscience seared with a hot iron* : and hath not the great idolatry of Christians, and the worship of the

dead particularly been diffused and advanced in the world by such instruments and agents, who have (Rom. i. 25,) “ changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever ? ” It is impossible to relate or enumerate all the various falsehoods and lies, which have been invented and propagated for this purpose ; the fabulous books forged under the names of apostles, saints, and martyrs ; the fabulous legends of their lives, actions, sufferings, and deaths ; the fabulous miracles ascribed to their sepulchres, bones, and other relics ; the fabulous dreams and revelations, visions and apparitions of the dead to the living ; and even the fabulous saints, who never existed but in the imagination of their worshippers. And all these stories the monks, the priests, the bishops of the church, have imposed and obtruded upon mankind, it is difficult to say, whether with greater artifice or cruelty, with greater confidence or hypocrisy and pretended sanctity, a more hardened face, or a more hardened conscience. The history of the church, saith Pascal, *is the history of truth* ; but as written by bigoted Papists, it is rather the *history of lies*. So well doth this prophecy coincide and agree with the preceding one, that *the coming of the man of sin* should be “ after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.” A farther character of these men is given in the following words, ‘ Forbidding to marry.’ The same hypocritical liars, who should promote the worship of demons, should also prohibit lawful marriage, &c.

The last note and character of these men is, “ commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe

and know the truth." . . . The same lying hypocrites, who should promote the worship of demons, should not only prohibit lawful marriage, but likewise impose unnecessary abstinence from meats : and these two, as indeed it is fit they should, usually go together, as constituent parts of the same hypocrisy. . . . It is as much the law and constitution of all monks to abstain from meats as from marriage. Some never eat any flesh, others only of certain kinds, and on certain days. Frequent fasts are the rule, the boast of their order ; and their carnal humility is their spiritual pride. So lived the monks of the ancient church ; so live, with less strictness perhaps, but with greater ostentation, the monks and friars of the church of Rome : and these have been the principal propagators and defenders of the worship of the dead, both in former and in later times. The worship of the dead is indeed so monstrously absurd as well as impious, that there was hardly any possibility of its ever succeeding and prevailing in the world, but by hypocrisy and lies ; but that these particular sorts of hypocrisy, celibacy under pretence of chastity, and abstinence under pretence of devotion, should be employed for this purpose, the Spirit of God alone could foresee and foretell. There is no necessary connexion between the worship of the dead, and forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats : and yet it is certain, that the great advocates of this worship have, by their pretended purity and mortification, procured the greater reverence to their persons, and the readier reception to their doctrines. But this idle, popish, monkish abstinence is as unworthy of a Christian, as it is unnatural to a man.'—*Bishop Newton on the Prophecies. Dobson's edition, p. 416, 438.*

(2.)— . . The Thessalonians, from some expressions in the former epistle, were alarmed, as if the end of the world was at hand, and Christ was coming to judgment. The apostle, to correct their mistakes and dissipate their fears, assures them, that the coming of Christ will not be yet awhile: there will be first a great *apostasy* or defection of Christians from the true faith and worship. This *apostasy* all the concurrent marks and characters will justify us in charging upon the Church of Rome. The apostle mentions this *apostasy* in another place, 1 Tim. iv. 1, &c. and specifies some articles, as ‘doctrines of *demons*,’ ‘forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats,’ which will warrant the same conclusion. The true Christian worship, is the worship of “the one only God,” through “the only one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;” and from this worship the church of Rome hath notoriously departed by substituting other mediators, and invoking and adoring saints and angels. Nothing is *apostasy*, if *idolatry* be not; and the same kind of *idolatry* is practised in the Church of Rome, that the prophets and inspired writers arraign and condemn as *apostasy* and rebellion in the Jewish church. The Jews never totally rejected the true God, but only worshipped him through the medium of some image, or in conjunction with some other beings: and are not the members of the church of Rome guilty of the same *idolatry*, and *apostasy* in the worship of images, in the adoration of the host, in the invocations of angels and saints, and in the oblation of prayers and praises to the Virgin Mary, as much or more than to God blessed for ever? *This is the grand corruption of the Christian church, this is THE APOSTASY, as it is emphatically called, and deserves to be called, THE APOSTASY that the apostle had warned the Thessalo-*

nians of before, **THE APOSTASY** that had also been foretold by the prophet Daniel. If the apostasy be rightly charged upon the Church of Rome, it follows of consequence that *the man of sin* is the pope, not meaning this or that pope in particular, but the pope in general, as the chief head and supporter of this apostasy. The apostasy produces him, and he again promotes the apostasy. He is properly *the man of sin*, not only on account of the scandalous lives of many popes, but by reason of their more scandalous doctrines and principles, dispensing with the most necessary duties, and granting or rather selling pardons and indulgences to the most abominable crimes. Or if by *sin* be meant idolatry particularly, as in the Old Testament, it is evident to all how he hath corrupted the worship of God, and perverted it from *spirit and truth* to superstition and idolatry of the grossest kind. He also, like the false apostle Judas, is *the son of perdition*, whether actively as being the cause and occasion of destruction to others, or passively as being destined and devoted to destruction himself. *He opposeth*; he is the great adversary to God and man, excommunicating and anathematizing, persecuting and destroying, by croisadoes, and inquisitions, by massacres and horrid executions, those sincere Christians, who prefer the word of God to all the authority of men. The heathen emperor of Rome may have slain his thousands of innocent Christians, but the Christian bishop of Rome hath slain his ten thousands. There is scarce any country that hath not at one time or other been made the stage of these bloody tragedies; scarce any age, that hath not in one place or other seen them acted. "He exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped;" not only above inferior magistrates, but likewise above bishops and primates,

exerting an absolute jurisdiction and uncontrolled supremacy over all, nor only above bishops and primates, but likewise above kings and emperors, deposing some and advancing others, obliging them to prostrate themselves before him, to kiss his toe, to hold his stirrup, to wait bare-footed at his gate, treading even upon the neck, and kicking off the imperial crown with his foot; not only above kings and emperors, but likewise above Christ and God himself, “making the word of God of none effect by his traditions,” forbidding what God hath commanded, as marriage, communion in both kinds, the use of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and the like, and also commanding or allowing what God hath forbidden, as idolatry, persecution, works of supererogation, and various other instances. “So that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.” He is therefore in *profession* a Christian, and a Christian bishop. His “*sitting* in the temple of God,” plainly implies his having his seat or cathedra in the Christian church; and he sitteth there *as God*, especially at his inauguration, when he sitteth upon the high altar in St. Peter’s church, and maketh the table of the Lord his footstool, and in that position receiveth adoration. At all times he exerciseth divine authority in the church, “shewing himself that he is God,” affecting divine titles and attributes as holiness and infallibility, assuming divine powers and prerogatives in condemning and absolving men, in retaining and forgiving sins, in asserting his decrees to be of the same or greater authority than the word of God, and commanding them to be received under the penalty of the same or greater damnation. Like another Salmoneus, he is proud to imitate the state and thunder of the Almighty; and is styled and pleased to be styled,—‘our Lord

God the pope ; another God upon earth ; king of kings and lord of lords. The same is the dominion of God and the pope. To believe that our Lord God the pope might not decree as he decreed, it were a matter of heresy. The power of the pope is greater than all created power, and extends itself to things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal. The pope doeth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful, and is more than God.' —Such blasphemies are not only allowed, but are even approved, encouraged, rewarded, in the writers of the church of Rome ; and they are not only the extravagances of private writers, but are the language even of public decretals, and acts of councils. So that the pope is evidently the god upon earth : at least there is no one like him, who “ exalteth himself above every God ; ” no one like him, “ who sitteth as God in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.”

... It was a matter of concern to all Christians to be forewarned of the great corruption of Christianity, that they might be neither surprised into it, nor offended at it ; and the caution was the more necessary, as “ the mystery of iniquity *was* already *working*.” The seeds of popery were sown in the Apostle's time ; for even then *idolatry* was stealing into the church, (1 Cor. x. 14,) and “ a voluntary humility, and worshipping of angels,” (Col. ii. 18.) “ strife and divisions,” (1 Cor. iii. 3.) an *adulterating* and “ handling of the word of God deceitfully,” (2 Cor. ii, 17 ; iv. 2.) a *gain* of *godliness* and “ teaching of things for filthy lucre's sake,” (1 Tim. vi. 5. Titus i. 11.) a vain observation of festivals, (Gal. iv. 10.) a vain distinction of meats, (1 Cor. viii. 8.) a “ neglecting of the body,” (Col. ii. 23.) *traditions*, and “ commandments and doctrines of men,” (Col. ii. 8, 22,)

with other corruptions and innovations. All heretics were in a manner the forerunners of *the man of sin*; and Simon Magus in particular was so lively a type and figure of *the wicked one*, that he hath been mistaken, as we see, for the wicked one himself.

The foundations of popery were laid indeed in the Apostle's days, but the superstructure was raised by degrees, and several ages passed before the building was completed, and *the man of sin* was revealed in full perfection.—*Ibid.* 402—406.

(3.) . . . ‘ You see one who opposeth and exalteth himself above all laws divine and human, sitting as God in the church of God, and shewing himself that he is God, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. You see a great *apostacy* in the Christian church which consists chiefly in the worship of demons, angels, or departed saints, and is promoted through the hypocrisy of liars, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats. You see the seven churches of Asia lying in the same forlorn and desolate condition that the angel had signified to St. John, their candlestick removed out of its place, their churches turned into mosques, their worship into superstition. In short, you see the characters of the beast and the false prophet, and the whore of Babylon, now exemplified in every particular, and in a city that is seated upon seven mountains; so that if the bishop of Rome had sat for his picture, a greater resemblance and likeness could not have been drawn.”—*Ibid.* 626.

(4.)—The Treatise (Bishop Newton's) on the prophecies, serves a double purpose ; it not only proves the truth of religion in a manner that never has been, nor ever can be controverted ; but it proves likewise, that the Roman Catholic is the *apostate* and the *Anti-christian* church, so frequently foretold both in the Old and New Testaments. Indeed so fatally connected is the refutation of Popery with the truth of Christianity, when the latter is evinced by the completion of the prophecies, that, in proportion as light is thrown upon the one, the deformities and errors of the other are more plainly exhibited.—*Cowper's Letter to Lady Hesketh. Grimshawe's Life of Cowper, Vol. I. p. 42.*

(5.)—2 Thessalonians ii. 3.—“ Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a departing first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.” The church of God hath ever been under persecution and afflictions, as may appear by the histories of all ages ; but God hath not failed to comfort them, and work their deliverance. . . . What should I speak of Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, Nero, Julian, and other tyrants ? They oppressed the servants of God, and kept them in great misery ; but God looked down from heaven, and was their helper in the time of need ; he brake their cords asunder, and delivered them. The more cruelty was extended or practised against them, the more glorious did God show himself in the overthrow of their enemies. Great oppressions, and cruel persecutions were done upon the saints of God by these and other wicked princes. But the most cruel of any that

ever were, are, or shall be, is the cruelty of Antichrist. By him the church of God shall suffer great tribulations, such as were not from the beginning of the world; and then shall his fury increase, and his tyranny be the greater, when his kingdom shall decay, and the days of his desolation shall be at hand. Primasius saith, "Then shall Babylon come to the ground, when she shall last of all take power to persecute the saints of God." For then will God arise, and will judge his own cause; he will deliver the afflicted, and will slay Antichrist with the breath of his mouth. Hereof Gregory saith thus: "The church, after these days of her affliction, shall afterwards, notwithstanding, be strengthened with great power, and might of preaching."

'Except there come a departing first.' There must first be a departing from faith in the church of God, and then shall be the coming of the Lord. . . . But this departing is diversely taken. Some understand it of the empire, that the kingdoms and countries which were before in subjection to that estate, shall depart from it, and that then Antichrist shall spring up. Others think that this is spoken of that departing wherein the godly have carried themselves from the obedience of the church of Rome. But others more truly say, that it is the departure from the doctrine, and religion, and love, and obedience of the gospel of Christ, whereof in another place, he saith, in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, and shall give heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. 1 Tim. iv. These men shall have a form of godliness, but shall deny the power thereof. They

shall turn their ears away from the truth, and will incline their hearts to hear fables.

The words of the apostle are plain, to show that there shall be a departing. But as we see, it is not agreed upon what manner of departing this shall be, nor by whom it shall be wrought. Our adversaries lay it unto us, saying, you have wrought this departing ; you have departed from the church of Rome ; you are they, of whom St. Paul hath spoken ; you are the founders of Antichrist ; so say they : but would to God they and their fathers, and the church of Rome, had not wrought this departure.

Bernard beheld the state, and pride, and disorders of the church of Rome in his time, and therefore said, ‘ It remaineth that the man of sin, that is, the son of perdition be revealed, even the devil which flieth not only in the dark, but destroyeth in the noon-day, which is not only changed into an angel of light, but is exalted above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.’ And Gregory saw who they were that should work this departing, and make way for Antichrist, therefore said, ‘ I speak it boldly, [whosoever calleth himself the universal priest, or desireth so to be called, (as now the pope doth,) in the pride of his heart, he is the forerunner of Antichrist.’

Now that we may yet better know what manner of departure that shall be, let us consider what St. Paul speaketh of the church of God ; which was in his time. (See 1 Cor. xiv.)....The Holy Scriptures were read openly in the presence of the people ; the people reverently kept silence, and gave ear, and understood the will of God, and submitted themselves unto it. The prayers were in a known tongue, so that the unlearned might understand them and say, Amen. The holy mysteries were duly ministered ; the people

received the sacraments of the Lord's Supper under both kinds, as Christ had instituted, and all communicated together.....

Let us look into the church of Rome, and behold the usage and behaviour thereof. Where shall we find that heavenly comeliness which St. Paul requires? Where is the comfortable reading of the Scriptures? Where are the people taught their salvation in Christ Jesus? Where is the brotherly meeting of all the congregation at the communion of the Lord's Supper? May we say of Rome, that it holds fast the form and fashion of that church which Christ and his apostles left unto us, and which the holy ancient fathers continued? Nay, rather we may say, of them with Chrysostom, 'They may have the chests and coffers wherein the treasures were sometimes kept, but the treasures they have not.' We may say, It is not now a house of prayer, but a den of thieves: we may say, it shall no more be called Bethel, the house of God, but Bethaven, the house of vanity, or of lying.

Jupiter and Bacchus, and the idols of the heathen, were not so dishonoured of their worshippers, as the almighty and everlasting, and only true God is dishonoured in that synagogue. I speak of Rome as it is now, and as it hath been these many years. For in the time of our elder fathers, it had great testimony of true holiness. Ignatius called it 'most chaste.' Tertullian said it was a happy church, because the apostles of Christ suffered martyrdom in it, and left their whole doctrine unto it. And in like sort, did others give unto Rome, as it was in those times, reverend and worthy commendation. But now saith he, O Rome, how much art thou changed from the old Rome! Thou which hast been the chief in all the world, art now the chief in all naughtiness. They

have forsaken the manner of life, and the love of the gospel, which they of old time had in Rome, and therefore cannot be inheritors of their commendation. . . . They lead men from trust in the blood of Christ, and teach them to believe in such things, and to put confidence in those creatures, which cannot profit or help them at all. You may remember what prayers they used, but bless your ears, for they are words full of horrible blasphemy. They said to the holy and blessed virgin Mary, the mother of our Redeemer and Saviour : ‘ Our trust and hope we put in thee, O virgin Mary ; defend us everlastingly.’ They say, ‘ O happy mother, which doth purge us from our sins ;’ and ‘ The merits of holy Mary, bring us to the heavenly kingdom.’ Again, ‘ Thou art the mediator between God and man, the advocate for the poor, the refuge of all sinners.’ O merciful Christ, what is become of thy passion ! Where is the price of thy blood ! how are we led away from thee, to seek redemption in a creature !

Again they say unto her, ‘ Thou art the lady of angels, thou art the queen of heaven ; command thy son, show thyself to be a mother. He is thy son, thou art his mother ; the mother may command, the child must obey.’ Again, they turn all that is spoken in the whole book of the Psalms of the prophet David, either of God, or of Christ, and apply it to the virgin Mary, and call that psalter, the psalter of blessed Mary. Whoever will take the pains to peruse it, shall find that comfortable speech of our Saviour, Matt. xi. “ Come unto me, all ye that are weary and laden, and I will ease you,” thus blasphemously abused in the second Psalm : “ Come unto her, all ye that travail and be heavily laden, and she will give rest and comfort to your souls.”

Another saith, 'The kingdom of God is of two parts, of justice and of mercy. He reserveth justice to himself, and the other part, that is mercy, he hath yielded unto his mother. Therefore one of them plays the proctor, and takes upon him to show the difference of those two courts, saying, you must appeal from the court of God's justice, to the court of his mother's mercy.' And is there not good cause he should give us this counsel, if it be true that he hath written? 'No mercy cometh from heaven to the earth, but it must pass by the hands of Mary; for she is the mediator of our salvation, of our justification, of our reconciliation, and of our participation.'

What is blasphemy, if this be not blasphemy? They which will seem somewhat to blush at these things, will perhaps excuse this, and call it spiritual dalliance. Unhappy are they, and heavy judgment shall abide them, that in such sort dally, and scorn the price of our redemption. Oh, let us open our eyes: we are sons of God; God hath given us eyes to see, and ears to hear, and hearts to understand. Let us judge uprightly, it is God's cause. Whosoever considers these, and such other great errors, must needs confess that the church of Rome hath wrought that departing whereof the apostle speaketh. In the late council of Trent, Cornelius, the Bishop of Bitonto, somewhat plainly acknowledged the great apostasy, and departing of the church of Rome, both in matters of faith, and in conversation and life. These are his words: 'Would God they were not gone wholly, with general consent from religion to superstition; from faith to infidelity; from Christ to Antichrist; from God to Epicurus, saying with wicked heart and filthy mouth, There is no God; neither hath there been this great while any pastor or pope, that regarded these

things. For they all, both pope, and cardinals, and others, sought their own, and not one of them sought for the things that pertain to Jesus Christ.' Yet say they, there can be no departing from faith in the church of Rome; the faith thereof cannot fail; for Christ hath said, Luke xxii. "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." And again, Matt. xvi. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Therefore in that place there can be no decay. This is the saying of some, who humble not themselves to know their error, who love the praise of men more than the praise of God; whose glory is their shame, who mind earthly things.

The apostle saith, there shall be a departing; that it shall not be among the Jews and infidels, but among those which were reckoned to be of the household of faith, and the children of God. What is it from which they shall depart, or wherein the decay shall be? Does he mean their riches, their gold, their silver, and bread, &c. No; but the doctrine of the gospel, and faith in Christ; the pure words which as silver from the earth are tried, and purified seven times in the fire; the well of water which springeth up into everlasting life shall decay in the house of God. The people shall shut their ears that they may not hear the truth, and shall give heed unto spirits of error, and doctrines of devils which speak lies through hypocrisy. And let them not say, the Church of Rome cannot err. For where did Christ ever give, or where have the apostles ever made mention of any such privilege granted to that church.'

St. Peter saith, "There were false prophets also among the people; even as there shall be false teachers among you, which privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that hath bought them,

and bring upon themselves swift destruction; and many shall follow their damnable ways, by whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of," 2 Peter ii. Paul warned the church of God at Ephesus, "Not only, that after his departing, grievous wolves should enter in among them, but of themselves should men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw disciples after them," Acts xx.

When Christ said, Luke xviii. "When the Son of Man shall come, shall he find faith upon the earth? and when he told his disciples that the abomination of desolation should stand in the holy place." When he warned them in this sort, Matt. xxiv. "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not; for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; so that if it were possible the very elect should be deceived"—it is most evident he spoke of that departing that should come, and should appear in the church of God; which departing, our forefathers did behold, and mark in their times, and which hath of late years appeared so manifestly, that no man, that is not wilfully blind can doubt thereof.

St. Paul knew not any such state of the church of Rome, nor any especial grant made unto it, in such sort, that it should never err. For unto the church of Rome he writeth: "Boast not thyself; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee; through unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Behold, therefore, the bountifulness and severity of God: towards them which have fallen, severity; but towards thee, bountifulness, if thou continue in his bountifulness, or else, thou shalt also be cut off." Rom. xi.

That is, if he spared not the Jews, his own people, how will he spare thee who art but a stranger? If thou continue not, thou shalt be cut off; it may be thou shalt also depart from the faith as the Jews have done; then shalt thou be as a withered branch, and shalt not draw any moisture from the root; then will God also forsake thee, and the end shall be worse than the beginning. In saying thus, he said not, Thou shalt not err.

If the church of Rome cannot err, what need have they who are of that church, either of the scriptures, or of the fathers, or of councils? Perhaps through this pride, they grew first to despise the holy scriptures, and would not direct their ways by them; they are high-minded, and boast themselves, that they are as Mount Zion, which shall not be moved.

Yet our Saviour likeneth the church sometimes to sheep, as in the fifteenth of St. Matthew: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of Israel;" sometimes to children, which are simple, and soon beguiled; sometimes to a vine, which is weak, and easily thrown down; sometimes to the moon, which waxeth, and is also in wane, and many times gives no light.

The ancient fathers compare the church of Christ to no one thing so commonly as to a ship; and who knows not how a ship is tossed hither and thither? how is it in danger of sands, and of rocks, and of pirates, and in danger of drowning by leaking? If the sheep were not a straying kind of cattle, why should they need a shepherd? If little children could guide themselves, what need had they of a guide? If the vine did not hang down, and lie on the ground, what need were there of props, or of one to set it up? If there were no fear for the passage of a ship; if it could not miscarry, what should it need a pilot?

Let no man therefore say, the church is safe for ever, it cannot err, it cannot decay. Such words are deceivable and lying words; for false prophets shall come; there shall be a desolation; there shall be a departing even in the house of God, and that day of Christ shall not come, except there come a departing first; and that man of sin be disclosed, even the son of perdition.—*Bishop Jewell on the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians.*

(6.)—2 Thessalonians ii. 3.—“ Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.”

As if the apostle had said, ‘ Let no man deceive you in this article of your faith, by any pretence whatsoever; for before Christ’s coming there shall come a great falling away from the Catholic faith, and by that means the man of sin will be revealed, who is the son of perdition.’—Note here, 1. Such a proneness there is in the nature and mind of man to embrace and entertain error, when once vented, that there is need of repeated dissuasives from it, and to guard persons against the poison and infatuation of it. *Let no man deceive you by any means.* Note, 2. A general apostacy or defection of the visible church from the faith of Christianity, must be before Christ’s coming to judgment; *except there come a falling away first.* It is foretold as a thing that would certainly come to pass. Note, 3. The revelation of Antichrist declared, *That man of sin shall be revealed, the son of perdition;* where by the man of sin, understand not a particular individual person, but a society and succession of men, such as is found in and amongst the papacy,

where sodomy, blasphemy, incest, adulteries, sorceries, murders, treasons, which are not only committed, but countenanced; not only acted, but authorized; do most evidently declare that there never was such an apostacy from Christianity since it had a being in the world, as is found amongst them. Note, 4. This man of sin is also styled *the son of perdition*. (1.) Actively, a destroying son, one that brings others to destruction, (2.) Passively, a son that shall be destroyed; Antichrist and all his adherents shall be destroyed, utterly destroyed, by Jesus Christ, and his kingdom shall perish without any hope of recovery; first destroying, and at last destroyed. Where, note, That our apostle at the first, the very first-mentioned Antichrist, doth declare his destiny; at his first rising he declares his fall and ruin. *That man of sin, the son of perdition.*—*Burkitt in loco.*

(7.)—Clearly revealed as is the will of God in Scripture, and perfectly calculated as is the gospel to effect the happiness of man, and faithful unto the death as many of the primitive Christians were, it is no less manifest that an *apostasy*, or falling away from the faith, was foretold. And who can read the Scriptures with an unbiassed mind, and look to the history of the Christian Church, and doubt for a moment that there has been an *apostasy*, or falling away from the truth and simplicity of the faith as it is in Jesus? Or who, in a like unbiassed manner, can read the prophecies respecting that *apostasy*, and cherish even a momentary doubt of their application?

. . . The power of working miracles is held by the Church of Rome as a mark of the true church: but the assumption of that power is truly a mark of

the *great apostasy*. And what else are wilful impositions, lying legends, and pretended miracles, the liquifying of the blood of St. Januarius, for example, still practised thrice every year in a church at Naples, but the deceivableness of unrighteousness? Or what creed is more common in Rome to which the Pope and Cardinals have given their sanction, than the working of miracles by the images of saints? Speaking of the self-same *apostasy*, it is said by the apostle Paul, "the day of Christ shall not come, except there come a *falling away* first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the *temple* of God, shewing himself that he is God! . . . It admits of no question, who it is that has exalted himself most highly in the church, that has assumed the claim of infallibility, and of titles which pertain to God alone, and to whom 'adoration' is paid, when he is enthroned in the most magnificent temple on earth, as the head of the church.

. . . . We ask not how all the subtlety of Jesuitism, or all the deceivableness of unrighteousness can rescue popery from the grasp of so many prophecies encircling it on every side; it is the purpose of these remarks, as connected with the evidence of prophecy, to show that even the long-continued and wide-spread *apostasy* from the Christian faith, which has often given a seeming sanction to infidelity, is itself a proof of the inspiration of Scripture; and that the war which has long been waged against those who kept the commandments of God, and had the testimony of Jesus, only serves the more to confirm the truth of the testimony.—*Keith's Evidence of Prophecy*, p. 429.

(8.)—‘ A *chaste woman* is a symbol of the *true church*; which, throughout the whole of Scripture is considered as the bride of the Lamb, and the mother of his spiritual children. On the other hand, a *harlot* is a symbol of an *apostate* and *idolatrous church*, *apostasy* and *idolatry* being spiritual whoredom and adultery.

. . . A harlot being thus used as a type of an *apostate church*, her *flesh* will denote her temporal possessions; and her *cup*, the blandishments by which she seduces men into idolatry.’¹—*Faber on the Prophecies*, Vol. I. p. 103. 4th edit.

(9.)—Mr. Faber in reply to some remarks made by Mr. Nisbett, on his *Dissertation on the Prophecies*, observes—‘ Because Mr. Nisbett takes up the idea, that *apostasy*, when understood in a religious sense; must mean an *abjuration of Christianity*, he censures me for applying the *apostasy of the man of sin to popery*, and charges me with being guilty of a manifest inconsistency. Before he passed this censure, he ought to have shewn, both that such must be the *exclusive* meaning of a *religious apostasy*, and that I maintained

¹ ‘ When the woman, the true church, was persecuted and afflicted, she was said to fly into the wilderness; and in like manner, when the woman, the false church, is to be destroyed, the vision is presented in the wilderness. For they are by no means, as some have imagined, the same woman under various representations. They are totally distinct and different characters, and drawn in contrast to each other; as appears from their whole attire and behaviour, and particularly from these two circumstances—that during the 1260 years, while the woman is fed in the wilderness, the beast and the scarlet whore are reigning and triumphant; and at the latter end, the whore is burnt with fire, when the woman, as his wife, hath made herself ready for the marriage of the Lamb.’—BP. NEWTON.

such to be the meaning of it. He has done neither. For my own part, so far from subscribing to the propriety of his definition, I directly controvert it. *A religious apostasy is simply a departure from the purity of the faith; and may be to a greater, or to a smaller, extent. It by no means necessarily involves a formal abjuration of Christianity.* Accordingly, St. Paul considers the giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines concerning demons as sufficient to constitute men *apostates*, though they should not go the length of renouncing the *whole* of the faith: and upon this apostolical authority, Mede and Newton scruple not to pronounce the corrupt church of Rome to be an *apostate* church. In this sense, therefore, of the word *apostasy*, I have been guilty of no inconsistency in applying *the apostasy of the latter days, and the man of sin to popery.*'

'He (Mr. Nisbett) further declares, that throughout my whole work I deny the church of Rome to be *apostate*. This assertion, like the former one, is made, I apprehend, on the ground that *religious apostasy* must *exclusively* mean a *direct abjuration of Christianity*. At least I can account for it in no other way. So far from my *denying* the church of Rome to be *apostate* in St. Paul's sense of the word, the whole of my work is built on the principle of its *being apostate*. In my very title-page, the papal superstition is styled *the papal apostasy*. At the very opening of my work, I carefully discriminate between individual apostasy, and the authorized apostasy of a community. And throughout the whole treatise, the words *apostate* and *apostasy* repeatedly occur in application to the church of Rome.—*Faber on the Prophecies*, Vol. II. Appendix, p. 539.

(10.)—"That day shall not come, except there first come an *apostasy*, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition : who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped : so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work : only he that now letteth, will let until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked one be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming : even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish ; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thess. ii. 3—10.

‘ With this remarkable description let us compare the pageants, and accredited phraseology of a Papal inauguration. When all is duly prepared, and when expectation stands on the very tiptoe, the lordly pontiff is revealed to his gazing votaries, seated upon the high altar in the adytum of the temple, and making the Lord’s table his footstool. In this attitude he receives what is called *the adoration* of the cardinals : a ceremony represented on the medals of Martin V. ; where two of them appear crowning the ‘ Pope while two others kneel before him with the inscription, *whom they create they adore*. Henceforth the style and title of the new god correspond with his inaugural worship. ‘ Our Lord God the Pope ; another God upon earth ; king of kings, and lord of lords. The same is the dominion of God and of the Pope.

To believe, that our Lord God the Pope might not decree as he decreed, it were a matter of heresy. The power of the pope is greater than all created power, and extends itself to things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal. The pope doeth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful ; and is more than God.'

'Such are the frantic ebullitions of impious vanity, which mark out, as the predicted head of the demonolatrous *apostasy*, that Italian priest ; whom his adherents fondly denominate the centre of Catholic unity, and from whom they arrogantly pronounce it heretical to separate.—*Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 482.

(11.)—The religion of the Papists is superstitious and idolatrous, and their church *apostatical*.—*Declaration of Archbishop Usher and eleven of his Episcopal brethren of the Irish bench in 1628.*

(12.)—The church is represented to us in the Apocalypse, under two different types. The first is that of the "Two Witnesses," (chap. xi.) who, it will hardly be denied, must represent, in some way, the church, or the ministry of the church, during some definite period of 1260 years, occurring for the most part, between the date of the prophecy, A.D. 96, and the present time. For this period of 1260 years, whether it begin at A. D. 533, or 606, or any other period, and whether it has come to an end or not, is the church represented as prophecying in sackcloth by the mouth of *two* (or the smallest legal number of) *witnesses* ; while the holy city, or dominant church, is, for the same period, trodden under-foot of the Gentiles.

Most Protestant commentators have gathered from

this, and with good reason, that the visible church of the middle ages, of the 1260 years, whenever occurring, that church which was not clothed with sackcloth, but "with purple and scarlet," (ch. xvii. 4,) was not the true church of God's witnesses; but a revival of Gentile abominations under a new guise, treading under-foot the holy city, and driving the two witnesses, the little flock, to bear their feeble testimony in sackcloth, and amid persecution.

Such is the first representation of the coming state of the church, as presented to the prophetic vision of St. John. "And the second is like unto it." In the very next chapter we are shewn "a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." That under this figure the Church of Christ is represented, will, we should think, be denied by no one. In the parallel passages of Isaiah, (ch. liv. and lx.) the translators of the Bible have distinctly interpreted, in their heads of chapters, the same type to mean the Gentile church.

But what is said of this woman, the true church? What is her history, as given by the unerring word of inspiration? She is forced to flee "into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand, two hundred, and three score days." (ch. xii. 6.) And in the next chapter we find a beast bearing "upon his head the names of blasphemy," having "power given unto him to continue forty and two months;" and during that period, "to make war with the saints, and to overcome them."

Now in all these statements we find an entire consistency, and in their united testimony a power which no candid mind will attempt to resist. It is evident that during these "forty and two months," or "twelve

hundred and sixty days," which as meaning in the prophetic language, 1260 years, must have extended from about the beginning of the Papal power, to nearly the present time; it is evident, we repeat, that in the apostle's view, there would be a *visible church* on the earth during all this period, but in a state of persecution, depression, and suffering. Clearly then, the Church of Christ, as the apostle viewed it, would not be found in the Papacy, towering over all the kingdoms of the west in proud supremacy, but among those scattered ones, against whom that Papacy was 'making war,' in Albi and in Savoy, and wherever else their 'testimony' was heard. But there is yet a farther corroboration of this view. In another chapter, the xviith, the prophet is shewn the "great whore," "which reigneth over the kings of the earth." Now of the meaning of this type there can be no doubt. "Whoredom," in prophetic language, always means the idolatry of a professing church, the apostasy of one which had been betrothed to Christ. Here, then, we see an apostate and idolatrous church, one too, persecuting the true church; for she is represented as "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;" (ch. xvii. 6.) and one of large and enduring dominion, for she is said to reign over ten kings, even "over the kings of the earth," and this, "until the words of God shall be fulfilled." Now that Papal Rome, and nothing but Papal Rome is here described, really admits of no reasonable doubt. It is not a Pagan empire; or a beast, and not a woman would have been the type: it is an apostate church, or an adulterous woman would not have been the symbol used. No part of the description, either of the ten kings, or the persecutions, or of the splendour of this apostate church agrees

with Constantinople. Therefore Rome must be the power denoted.

But let any one who hesitates to admit the whole of our positions, at least remember this ; that beyond the least doubt, *some* apostasy is represented as reigning over the kings of the earth ; while the saints of Jesus, the members of the true church, are only known by the shedding of their blood. Again, therefore, we see, that while the true church is indeed visible, it is not as the predominant church, but as a small and persecuted body.

There only remains one further observation, which is this :—*Babylon is to be destroyed !* “ She shall be utterly burned with fire : for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.” (Rev. xviii. 8.)

This clear and positive prediction seems to us utterly to negative the position of Mr. Palmer,¹ that Rome is a portion of the Church of Christ. No part of that church shall be thus visited. “ The gates of hell shall never prevail against it.” Therefore Rome, which is to perish, has no portion with that divinely-preserved community. Perpetuity and everlasting salvation are promised to the church ; but to Rome, nothing but utter destruction. Individuals who are of the family of God, may and do exist within her pale, for they are explicitly warned to “ come out of her ; ” but for herself as the *Great Apostasy*, there remains no hope. The language employed to signify God’s hatred of her and his determination to avenge the blood of his saints upon her, is the most emphatic that the Bible contains.

Must we not add, that if she be rightly called Babylon, then this name cannot have lately become

¹ A Treatise on the Church of Christ, by the Rev. W. Palmer, M. A.

hers. She was Babylon, and not Jerusalem, when she was "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;" and when did she more revel in these delights than in the thirteenth century, when *six hundred thousand* of the poor Albigenses were immolated beneath her car? Why, therefore, attempt to date her apostasy from a comparatively modern date? It is not a synod or a decree, that can make her state worse in modern times, than it was in the days of Hildebrand, or Dominic, or Cæsar Borgia. On the contrary, the advancing power of Protestantism has placed a check on her enormities; and it certainly appears strange to contend, that since she has abandoned massacre and open lewdness, she has become an apostate church; but that while her pontiffs were monsters of iniquity, and her decrees carried fire and sword through the world, she was a portion of the Catholic community!

But we must not conclude without adverting to the corroborative evidence of a second witness. Not only the latest survivor and most beloved of the apostles, but he also who was, in labours and in success, the very "chiefest of all the apostles," confirms this view. St. Paul, writing to the church of Thessalonica, tells them with the greatest certainty and distinctness, that "the day of Christ," that glorious day, when "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ;" shall not come, until there has first been seen a great falling away; "and that *man of sin* be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.)

Now we shall not insist upon the exact and literal

fulfilment of this remarkable prediction, in the annual exaltation of the Pope, calling himself by the incommunicable name of God, "Holiness,"—above the high altar of St. Peter's at Rome, there to receive divine honours and adoration: the only point on which we shall rest, is that on which St. Paul so entirely agrees with St. John; that there should be a great "falling away," an APOSTASY; and *that*, not of a few individuals, or a small portion of the Catholic Church, but a great and extensive apostasy, of such sort that the temple of God should be given over to false and idolatrous worship: agreeing with the treading under foot the holy city; the driving the church into the wilderness; and the reign of a false and idolatrous Church, "the great whore," over all the ten kingdoms of the Roman earth.

In this general view, then, both St. Paul and St. John concur, and we are left in no doubt, therefore, that in the history of the church, such an event as this must be found. The Church of England in divers passages of her homilies, has plainly told us that the fulfilment of these prophecies has been seen in the apostasy, the idolatry, and the persecuting deeds of the church of Rome. But Mr. Palmer repudiates this view, and asserts that the church of Rome was a part of the Catholic church of Christ before the Reformation, and continues a part of that church still. This view, however, is wholly inadmissible except Mr. Palmer can satisfactorily dispose of these passages in the writings of St. Paul and St. John. A falling away, an apostasy, he must point out. This cannot be evaded, or postponed; as obscure, uncertain, or probably yet in futurity; for without attempting to fix precise dates, a multitude of marks are given by the Apostles, which fix this fact to

the times which have elapsed since the apostolic days.

. . . While necessitated to remain in an externally divided state, we must remember that all Christians, under whatever sectional banner they may arrange themselves, are in reality fighting under one captain, and acting as various divisions in one great army. And among the chief earthly enemy, to their captain and their cause, has ever been, and will ever be, the great *apostasy*, 'the Man of Sin,' **POPERY**.—*Essays on the Church. By a Layman.* 1838. p. 351—360.

(13.)—But Paul, by the spirit of prophecy, assured them, (the Thessalonians) that Christ would not come to judgment till a falling away, or *the apostasy* of a great body of professed Christians from the true Gospel of Christ had previously taken place. Doubtless many apostasies occurred in the primitive ages, under different heresiarchs: but all the circumstances of this prediction were never verified, except in that departure from the faith, and that usurpation and spiritual tyranny connected with it, which took place by means of the church of Rome: and the manifest absurdity of all other interpretations, as clearly shewn in the controversies of those who contend for one or another of them against their opponents, abundantly prove this. No apostasy of equal magnitude and duration, no delusions equally pernicious and abominable, have taken place, since the Apostle's days. The imposture of Mohammed alone can be at all compared with it, and this could not be here intended: for that impostor and his successors were not placed in the temple of God, the visible church; but *without* it and in direct opposition to the very name of Chris-

tianity ; they propagated their delusions mainly by the sword, and not by “ lying miracles ; ” and indeed the impieties of Mohammed never equalled the blasphemies here predicted. In connexion with this *apostasy*, “ the man of sin ” would be revealed. In the language of prophecy a king generally signifies a succession of monarchs, of the same family or dynasty, carrying on the same design. Thus “ the man of sin ” does not mean a single person, but a succession of men, impious in themselves ; and conducting the same wicked design of corrupting Christianity, in doctrine, worship, and practice ; establishing an intolerable tyranny on religious pretences ; and using all kinds of seduction, iniquity, and cruel persecution, to induce mankind to adopt the antichristian system. This “ man of sin ” would be the son of perdition ; a genuine descendant of Judas, the apostle and the traitor, who sold his Lord for money, and betrayed him with a kiss ; a peculiar factor and agent of Satan, in destroying the souls of men ; and finally sinking himself into perdition as his inheritance. It is manifest that no succession of men have yet appeared on earth, to whom this description fully accords, except that of the Roman pontiffs, as in succession the visible head of the popish church. This deceiver would “ oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or is worshipped,” either by Christians or Pagans ; thus the Roman Pontiffs have opposed the truths, commandments, and disciples of Christ, in every age and by every means ; they have opposed the prophetic office of Christ by teaching human inventions ; his priestly office, by the doctrine of human merits and created intercessors ; and his kingly office, by changing and dispensing with his laws. They have “ exalted themselves above all that is called

God and is worshipped," by claiming authority to forgive sins, even in those who manifestly continue impenitent; by granting indulgences to men to break the commandments of God; by dispensing with his laws, and placing their own decrees above them, as if of superior validity; and by presuming to give meaning and authority to the Scriptures themselves, which must not be understood in any other sense, than what they impose upon them. Moreover, this "man of sin sits as God in the temple of God," and we must therefore, look for him within the visible church; where he blasphemously usurps the throne of God, shewing himself to be God. Many Roman emperors affected divine honours and demanded adoration; but there was no antecedent 'apostasy' from Christianity or the worship of Jehovah; and they might rather be said to sit in the temple of Jupiter or Mars, than in that of God; whose temple must be considered to be among his professed worshippers, and not among avowed heathens. But the Roman pontiff, claiming to be the universal head of the whole church of God, called by his flatterers 'Vice-God,' 'a God upon earth,' arrogating the title of 'his Holiness,' boasting of 'infallibility,' claiming a right to depose kings, and bestow kingdoms on whom he pleases, with those impious claims before mentioned, answers so exactly to the description here given, that we cannot reasonably doubt for whom it was designed. While the Roman Pontiff opposes the worship of God by enjoining the worship of images and of saints and angels, and the authority of his laws, to enforce subjection to his own edicts; he himself may be called the great idol, as well as the great tyrant of the Romish church; as he demands the most abject submission, and prostration from all men, both in body and soul, and

pours contempt on all authority human and divine. But particulars cannot here be more fully insisted on. It suffices to shew that the Roman pontiffs answered, and still do answer to this description, as the person intended is the architype of an excellent portrait, and we may venture to assert, that no other succession of men ever did thus accord to it ; perhaps no single individual within the visible church.—*Scott's Commentary*, 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4. Notes.

(14.)—To stir up Timothy, and others by him, to adhere stedfastly to the great “mystery of godliness,” the apostle declared that the Holy Spirit spoke in the most express and decisive manner, not only by Daniel, and others of the ancient prophets, but to Paul himself by immediate revelation, and perhaps to several of his brethren, concerning certain persons in the latter days, under the Christian Dispensation, or in after-times, who would *apostatize* from the true faith of the gospel. This *apostasy* would be effected by men’s hearkening to false teachers, who would be influenced by seducing spirits, and thus they would embrace “doctrines of devils,” or demons ; and adopt such notions about the souls of the dead, as would introduce the worship of saints as intercessors, and of angels, as spirits superior to men though inferior to God. This was a species of idolatry, like that of the heathen, in worshipping their departed monarchs, legislators, and benefactors, as ‘*demons*,’ or a middle order of beings between God and man. And as devils are the real objects of all worship paid to mere creatures, so this delusion would tend to gratify the ambition of these apostate spirits. These doctrines and practices would be supported by “the hypocrisy of liars,” who

would invent a variety of legends, impose on men with pretended miracles and revelations, cheat them by fabricated tales, and thus carry on an infamous traffick by forgery and imposture under the pretext of great sanctity, to the aggrandizing of themselves, and the deluding of the credulous multitude. Nor would these men feel remorse for their lies and forgeries, however impious and destructive, as the habit of villainy, under the mask of extraordinary piety, would cauterize their consciences, and render them entirely callous, even as the external skin becomes unfeeling by being frequently "seared with a hot iron." To maintain their usurpation over men's minds, and to fix a large body in their interest, by detaching them from other connexions, as well as to amuse mankind by the appearance of uncommon sanctity, they would discourage and even forbid marriage, as if it were an unholy estate, and unfit for devout persons: they would deny the liberty of marrying to numbers, especially to the clergy; by means of which, all kind of abominations would be introduced and connived at. They would also enjoin abstinence from this and the other kind of meat, either entirely, or on particular days and seasons; by this likewise they would keep up their authority over men's consciences, and impose upon the multitude with apparent devotion, whilst they perpetrated all kind of iniquities as the Pharisees had done before them. . . . Every one who is at all acquainted with ecclesiastical history, must know what *apostasy* and corruption of Christianity has most entirely accorded to this prediction. The Judaizing teachers, and the Gnosticks, and others, contended indeed for some of these superstitions, "the mystery of iniquity," in these respects did "even then work;" but it was reserved for the Church of Rome fully to prove the

truth of the Scriptures by accomplishing these predictions in their most detestable enormities. It has been shewn in what manner the errors of the Judaizing teachers, and the traditions of the Pharisees on the one hand, and the speculations of the heathen philosophers, on the other, corrupted the pure doctrine of Christianity in the primitive times. (Notes, Col. ii. 8—23.) But it should not be forgotten that in subsequent ages, especially in the Roman Church, the mythology of the Pagans, and the writings of the poets, helped to introduce still further corruptions. For what are the *Nuns* of Popery, but the vestal *Virgins* of the Romans engrafted upon Christianity? The Monks indeed are an unprecedented addition. Saints and angels as mediators, answer to the demigods and heroes of the Pagans; and the numerous processions and festivals of the Papists, and the method of observing them, answer with surprising exactness to those described in Homer and Virgil, especially in the latter.—*Scott's Commentary*, 1 Tim. iv. 1—5.

(15).—St. Paul in writing to the Thessalonians concerning the man of sin (2 Thess. ii. 3—10.) who was to be fully revealed in the following ages, reminds them, that the mystery of iniquity, though at that time restrained from a full manifestation, did already work; teaching us, that the seeds of that grand apostasy, which at length overspread the whole professing church, were sown, and springing up, at the time of his writing. And he mentions several particulars in his epistle to the Colossians (chap. ii. 18—23.) such as a voluntary or self-devised humility, in worshipping angels as mediators or intercessors; a dogmatic inhibition of

things which God had left free ; and a specious scheme of will-worship and mortification, which, under pretence of self-denial, did really gratify pride, vanity, and self-righteousness. The progress of our history will shew what a harvest of dreadful and wide-spreading evils were produced from these principles, until at length the gospel of Christ was wholly obscured, and the lives and consciences of men were given up to the power of Antichrist, who, as God, insolently sat down in the temple of God, and exalted himself above all laws, human and divine. It is sufficient to my purpose at present, to take notice, that the beginnings of that spiritual infatuation, which so long detained the world in chains, and darkness, and slavery, under the tyranny of the church of Rome, were observable in St. Paul's time, and therefore deserve a place in the list of those pestilent heresies by which the enemy of souls attempted to defile the faith, and disturb the peace, of the primitive church.—*Rev. John Newton's Works. A Review of Ecclesiastical History. Book ii. ch. iv.*

(16.)— . . It is easy to see how the prevalence of false doctrines in the church, with respect to the mediation of dead saints, and the lawfulness and efficacy of worship addressed to them, and to their images and dry bones, had the effect of hiding Christ, the only mediator between God and man, and the Sun of Righteousness, from the eyes of men. The saints and their images and relics having, by the influence of the false doctrines which have been described, been made to occupy the place of Christ, he was necessarily kept out of view.¹ Having so many other mediators, men

¹ The tendency of saint-worship, to hide Christ from the eyes of men, will appear from the following account of the offerings,

had no need of the only true mediator, and did not seek him. But the smoke from the pit darkened *the* air as well as the sun. The natural air is the medium of respiration and life to our bodies, and also the medium through which the light of the natural sun is communicated to us. The symbolical air or atmosphere, when the symbols of the context are used to denote spiritual objects, may therefore signify the pure and heavenly truths of the gospel, which are, as it were, the element of spiritual respiration to the soul of man, and also the medium through which the saving light of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, is communicated to us. These pure and heavenly truths were obscured and darkened by the mixture of false doctrines, which, like smoke, issued from the pit of the abyss; and the light of the Sun of righteousness could no longer shine through the medium of the truths of his own gospel thus corrupted.

Having thus endeavoured to fix the signification of the symbols, we shall find little difficulty in ascertaining who was the fallen star, or apostate Christian bishop, that was the great agent in opening the pit of the abyss. The acknowledged head of the Christian church during the sixth and seventh centuries was the pope, or bishop of Rome; and history informs us, not only

made in two successive years, at the altars of Christ, of Thomas a Becket, and the Virgin Mary, at Christ Church, Canterbury—

In one year the offerings stood as follows—

	£	s.	d.
At Christ's altar	3	:	2 : 6
At Becket's	832	:	12 : 6
At the Virgin's	93	:	5 : 6

The next year's offerings were—

At Christ's altar	0	:	0 : 0
At Becket's	554	:	6 : 3
At the Virgin's	4	:	1 : 8

that the popes gave no opposition to the doctrines respecting the mediation and worship of saints, and the veneration to be paid to their images and bones, but that they were the active and most zealous promoters of these doctrines, and of all the idolatrous practices which pervaded the Christian church. I conceive the pope of Rome therefore, to be the fallen star, or apostate bishop, to whom was given the key of the pit of the abyss. Nor will it appear to us wonderful, that such an office should be assigned to him who pretended to be the vicar of Christ upon earth, and the visible head of the church, when we recollect, that the lawful head of the Jewish church, the high priest of the Levitical dispensation, was the chief and principal agent in the crucifixion of Christ.—*Cuninghame on the Apocalypse*. P. 79—81. 2nd Edit.

(17.)—Dr. Faussett, adverting to the pernicious errors and ‘insidious cavils’ of the Oxford Tract Writers, observes ‘The leading particulars in which this increasing aberration from Protestant principles has displayed itself, may perhaps be considered as the following:—a disposition to overrate the importance of Apostolical Tradition, and the authoritative teaching of the church—exaggerated and unscriptural statements of doctrine with regard to the two Sacraments; and a general tendency on the one hand to depreciate the principles of Protestantism, and the character and conduct of the Reformers, and on the other, not indeed absolutely to deny the grosser corruptions of popery, but so far to palliate her errors, and display in the most favourable light whatever remnant of good she still retains, as to leave it in a manner doubtful to which side the balance of truth inclines, and to banish from the mind

of the unwary Protestant every idea of the extreme guilt and danger of a reunion with an *Idoltrous and Antichristian Apostasy*.—*Sermon preached before the University of Oxford.* May 1838. P. 15.

(18.)—If the Roman church be really that predicted apostasy, which the most approved interpreters of prophecy unanimously maintain, we may rest assured, that every encouragement afforded to a system thus offensive in the sight of heaven, whether by the grant of political influence, or by any general disposition to relapse into her errors, or even to relax from that strenuous resistance to her power and principles, which was established at the Reformation, is a national *sin*, for which the severest national chastisement may be reasonably anticipated. This was precisely the view taken by the late excellent Bishop Van Mildert, when, in his place in the House of Lords, he joined in the ineffectual opposition to what was called ‘Catholic Emancipation.’

‘Convinced, too,’ said he, ‘as I am, (and that upon no light or superficial grounds, but after many years of studious consideration and inquiry,) that the religion of popery is distinctly and awfully pointed out in Scripture, as the one great *apostasy* from the truth, the declared object of Divine displeasure, I feel that I should not be discharging the duty I owe to a far higher tribunal than your Lordships’, if I assented to any thing which I believed to have a tendency to strengthen or uphold such a corrupt and erroneous system. . . . I dare not be instrumental in uniting popery with protestantism, nor in destroying or weakening the distinction between idolatrous superstition, and the

pure worship of God in spirit and in truth.'—*Ibid.* Appendix, note F.

(19.)—...The accumulated mass of error was not reared all at once. If it had been so; if the system of Romanism in its present form had presented itself in its maturity and full growth of heresy to the minds of men yet retaining "the form of sound words," and the savour of Divine truth received by tradition from the Apostles, and those who followed in their steps; it is impossible that they should not have recoiled from the "strong delusion," and refused to "believe the lie, and denounced the *apostate* church, which presumed to impose such a "yoke of bondage" on their necks. But the enemy who sowed the tares was too wily to attempt at once so violent an outrage upon the truth of God, and upon the understandings and pious feelings of his church. By slow and scarcely observed degrees he brought in doctrines which were little suspected of their true tendency: these gradually made their way to popular acceptance and belief, assisted by the decreasing knowledge of the word of God, and the darkness consequently gathering over the minds of men; and like the stones of a building, they were brought one by one, and fitted into the place prepared for them, so as most effectually to conduce to the rearing up of that vast fabric of error and imposture which in its complete and finished state we gaze at with wonder as the master-piece of Satan.—*The Rev. Professor Scholefield's Sermon preached before the Prayer Book and Homily Society.* P. 17, 18.

(20.)—... Let us continue with unabated zeal to protest against those abominations and corruptions which characterize the *apostate* church, and render her the peculiar object of the Divine indignation. Let us fortify ourselves against the insidious attempts which are ignorantly or artfully made to represent her as improved in her spirit, or amended in her character and conduct; by the recollection that she has never yet as a church, renounced in any single instance, one of those unscriptural and antichristian doctrines or practices which formed the ground of our original separation from her communion. We must be blinded indeed to the events which are taking place in every country to which her influence extends, if we can for a moment be persuaded to forget, that she is at this day as decidedly as she has ever been, the woman, as revealed to St. John arrayed in purple and scarlet, drunken with the blood of the saints, and having her name as distinctly written upon her forehead, ‘Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.’ Admonished by the sure word of prophecy of the awful judgments which await her, and all who favour or adhere to her in this day of her visitation, let us avoid *every* measure, let us abjure *every* proceeding which may tend in any the slightest degree to connect or identify our country with her. Let us remove ourselves to even a greater distance from her, and show more distinctly and decidedly by our conduct, that we *have* come out, and are separate. Let us more devoutly honour and sanctify the Sabbath, which she profanes and desecrates. Let us more diligently aid in disseminating, at home and abroad, the written word of God, of which she forbids and impedes the circulation. Let us more earnestly strive to enlighten and instruct mankind whom she would retain in ignorance

and darkness. Let us be more anxious to spread around us the principles and blessings of genuine liberty, in proportion as she labours to impose perpetual chain, on the minds and consciences of men. Let us endeavour with augmented exertions to promote the increase of vital, spiritual, evangelical piety, in the place of which she substitutes processions and pilgrimages, prostrations before altars and images, and invocation of saints, and the adoration of the host.—*The Crisis, by the Rev. Edward Cooper.* p. 241.

(21.)— . . . The long apostasy and general corruption of the professors of Christianity, so plainly foretold, and under such express and particular characters, in the apostolic writings; all the world may see, has been abundantly fulfilled in the church of Rome. Who that had lived in those days, when Christianity was struggling under all the incumbent weight of Jewish bigotry, and pagan intolerance and persecution, could from the state of things have possibly conjectured, that a rising sect, every where spoken against, would ever have given birth to a tyrant, who would *oppose and exalt himself* above all laws, human and divine, *sitting as God in the temple of God*, and claiming and swaying a sceptre of universal spiritual empire! Who, that beheld the low estate of the Christian Church in the first age of its existence, could ever have divined that a remarkable character would one day arise out of it, who should establish a vast monarchy, whose coming should be *with all power, and signs, and lying wonders* (pretended miracles) *and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness*, commanding the worship of demons, angels, or departed saints;—*forbidding to marry, and command-*

ing to abstain from meats. In short, we see the characters of the *beast and the false prophet, and the harlot of Babylon* now exemplified in every particular, and in a city that is seated upon seven mountains: so that if the Pontiff of Rome had sat for his picture, a more accurate likeness could not have been drawn. The existence of these monstrous corruptions of the purity and simplicity of the gospel, which no human penetration could have foreseen, is a great confirmation and standing monument of the truth of the gospel, and demonstrates the divine inspiration of those persons who wrote these books, and circumstantially predicted future events and future corruptions of religion, infinitely beyond the reach of all conception and discernment merely human.—*Rev. T. H. Horne's Introduction to the Bible*, Vol. i. p. 409. 2nd Ed.

(22.)—Idolatry being represented in the Old Testament as apostasy from the law of Moses and the God of Israel, the like idolatry in the church of Rome may well be accounted an apostasy from the Christian faith.—*Dr. Whitby quoted in Mant and D'Oyly's Bible*, 1 Tim. iv.

(23.)—... If the Church of England did not maintain this fundamental truth, that “*we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings,*”—she would have no pretensions to the title of a Church of Christ—she would be an *apostate* church, and every man who knew and loved the salvation of his Redeemer, would protest against her as firmly as against the Church of Rome. But it is the very vital

article of her spiritual existence; and it is the ignorance of this, and the neglect of this great, essential truth of Christianity by her members, that has left us to this day so criminally negligent of that awful superstition, whose every error is to be referred to her *apostasy* from this great truth of God; and her substitution of refuges of lies, for that refuge, that only refuge of guilty man, a crucified, and risen, and ascended Saviour.—*Truth and Error contrasted by Rev. R. J. M'Ghee*, p. 188.

(24.)—... Our own statement would be, that Rome is an *apostate church*; and this we think would have met Bishop Davenant's notion. Our objection to the statements of Dr. Daubeny and the (Oxford) Tract writers, is, that they do not appear to us to represent Rome as an *apostate church*; but rather claim her as a 'sister,' though they lament her errors; while they repudiate the Protestant churches, and would not receive them to their fellowship, were they purity itself.—*Christian Observer*, 1837. p. 178.

(25.)—A righteous ancestry felt the impossibility of peace with Rome.... The echo of their voices, trumpet-tongued as they were, so that the piercing call shook Europe as with an earthquake, still lingers on our mountains and in our valleys; still it is syllabing to us, that Popery is the predicted *apostasy* of the latter times—still discoursing of Rome as the mystic Babylon of the Apocalypse, and reiterating the summons, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her

plagues."—*Rev. H. Melvill's Tercentenary Sermon.*
See British Pulpit, Vol. iv. No. 102.

(26.)— . . . The papal church, in its representation at Sirmium, through the oriental and occidental communion, was, in this manner, guilty of general apostasy. Its head and its members, or the Roman pontiff and his clergy, conspired, through eastern and western Christendom, against Catholicism, and fell into heresy. The defection extended to the Greeks and Latins, and was sanctioned by the Pope. No fact, in all antiquity, is better attested than this event, in which all the cotemporary historians concur, without a single discord to interrupt the general harmony.

The world on this occasion was blessed with two cotemporary Arian Pontiffs. During the expatriation of Liberius, Felix was raised to the papacy, and remains to the present day a saint and a martyr of Romanism. This hierarch, notwithstanding, was, without any lawful election, ordained by Arian bishops, communicated with the Arian party, embraced, say Socrates and Jerome, the Arian heresy, and violated a solemn oath, which with the rest of the Roman clergy, he had taken to acknowledge no other bishop while Liberius lived. Athanasius, the champion of Trinitarianism, was so ungenteel as to style this saint 'a monster raised to the papacy by the malice of antichrist.' The church, at this time, had two Arian heads, and God had two heretical vicars-general. One viceroy of heaven was guilty of Arianism, and the other, both of Arianism and perjury. Baronius and Bellarmine should have informed Christendom, which of these vice-gods, or whether both,

possessed the attribute of infallibility.—*Edgar's Variations of Popery*, 2nd Ed. p. 271.

(27.)— . . . If our church, however pure in doctrine and principle, be yet chargeable in the persons of those who constitute the great body of her members, with the guilt of indifference to the general cause of Christianity, how precarious is her situation, how imminent her danger! If she thus partake of Laodicean lukewarmness, what can she expect but Laodicean treatment? If forgetful of her duties, her obligations, and her privileges, she has left her first love, what can she anticipate, except she repent, but that her candlestick will be removed out of its place? Let her remember who hath said, "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth." Let her remember that if she comes not out of Babylon, she will perish with Babylon. If she partakes of its sins, she will also receive of its plagues. Let her remember that the only ecclesiastical power which has yet opposed or discountenanced the free circulation of the Word of God, has been the Church of Rome. And shall the Church of England, in such an opposition, unite and identify herself with one, whom she regards as *anti-christian* and *apostate*? Shall she prominently stand forward the opposer of an institution, which strikes at the root of papal corruption, and aims a deadly blow at heathenism and idolatry? Does she not see that by such a conduct she is undermining also her own foundations, and bringing herself down to the ground?—*Rev. Edward Cooper's Letters to an Inquirer after Divine truth*, p. 226.

(28.)— . . . The Church of Christ are the redeemed of all nations and of all ages ; and the gates of hell shall never prevail so as to prevent the salvation of any one of them. Those of them who are upon earth are scattered among a number of visible organized bodies, which, in an inferior sense, are called churches. The church in Rome was one of these, while she held the true faith and pure worship, as instituted by Christ ; but in her purest state she had no superiority over other churches ; she never had any right to call herself by way of eminence, much less exclusively, *the church*. Christ never gave to her, or to any national, provincial, or particular church, a promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against it ; but he gave warning to all, that if they departed from the faith, they should be cut off. This has been notoriously the case with Rome ; and though she retains the name of Christian, she has become the reverse of what the name implies ; and is conspicuously the place where Satan has his seat.

In short the promise of Christ holds out no security to either churches or individuals, but in the way of persevering in faith and holy practice. Christ said to his disciples on one occasion, " Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Now, if Judas had argued as papists do, he needed not to have thought himself in danger of perdition, though he had betrayed his Lord. He might have said, if Christ's word be true, I am sure of the kingdom of heaven. But Judas had not the presumption to reason like modern papists. He *apostatized*, and he perished ; yet Christ spoke the truth, and his word will be verified in the salvation of all true disciples. The Church of Rome also *apostatized*, and though Christ promised that the gates of hell should

not prevail against *his* church, he has suffered them to prevail against that of Rome. He has removed the candlestick, that is the branch of his church that was once in Rome, out of the place, as he did to many other churches, for the same reason. Of some, indeed, the memory is perished from the earth; but for reasons known fully to himself alone, he suffered the Church of Rome to retain a name and a visible form, after the spirit was gone, and so become the antitype of Babylon, the oppressor and persecutor of the Church of God.—*The Protestant*, Vol. ii. p. 159.

PART II.

ON THE IDOLATROUS CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"NOTHING CAN BE MORE ANTICHRISTIAN THAN IDOLATRY."—BISHOP BURGESS.

PART II.

**ON THE IDOLATROUS CHARACTER OF THE
CHURCH OF ROME.**

"NOTHING CAN BE MORE ANTICHRISTIAN THAN IDOLATRY."—BISHOP BURGESS.

PART II.

ON THE IDOLATROUS CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

(29.)—GOD is so tenacious of his honour, in respect of *idolatry*, that the least approach to it, especially in the conduct of his professed worshippers, excites his hottest displeasure. . . . It is observable that throughout the Scriptures the words *fury*, *indignation*, *jealousy*, as ascribed to God, and *hatred*, *abomination*, *detestable things*, and other strong expressions of abhorrence in respect of man's conduct, are principally used when idolatry is spoken of.—*Scott's Commentary*. Exodus, chap. xx. 5.

(30.)—Deut. xiii. 6—11. At the head of capital crimes under the Jewish law was placed *idolatry*. Not only the act itself, but every attempt to seduce men to it, and every mode of conduct which presupposed or obviously led to it. Against this offence the strictest rigour was exercised; no partiality for the dearest relative was to induce concealment; no dignity to silence accusation; no multitude of offenders to deter from punishment. This severity, whilst it conduced to preserve the allegiance due to the Supreme Jehovah, inseparably associated the feelings of detestation and

abhorrence with the crime of idolatry, not with the persons of the Canaanites; and proved to the Jews that they were commanded to exterminate the seven nations, not from any principle of personal resentment or national hostility, but merely as criminals condemned by God.¹—*Dr. Graves, quoted in D'Oyly and Mant's Bible.*

¹ If there be one sin more offensive to God than another it is idolatry: he has in an especial manner marked his abhorrence of this sin, and denounced the heaviest judgments against those who commit it. Image-worship in all its forms and degrees, is a direct violation of God's law, which expressly prohibits even the making of an image for religious purposes—"Thou shalt not *make* unto thee any graven image," &c. *Exod. xx. 4.*

When a Christian church lapses into idolatry, it becomes apostate, and forfeits all claim to the title of a *Christian* church in the strict and legitimate sense of the term. 'Nothing,' as Bishop Newton observes, 'is apostasy if idolatry be not,' and Bishop Burgess remarks that, 'nothing can be more antichristian than idolatry.' As Christianity and idolatry are incompatible with each other, there can be no such thing as an idolatrous Christian church, the epithet conveys a contradiction in terms, and is, indeed, a palpable absurdity, we therefore never hear it used. We might as well say a free-slave as an idolatrous-Christian. Freedom and slavery are contradictory terms, so are Christianity and idolatry.

This view of the subject is in strict accordance with the Homilies of our Church, which state in the Homily against the Peril of Idolatry, that 'it is not possible we should be worshippers of images, and the true servants of God also; and St. Paul teacheth in 2 Corinthians vi. affirming expressly that there can be no more consent or agreement between the temple of God—which all true Christians be—and images, than between righteousness and unrighteousness, between light and darkness, between the faithful and the unfaithful, or between Christ and the devil.' And again, God 'is as much forsaken, and the bond of love between man and him, as much broken, by idolatry which is spiritual fornication, as is the knot and bond of marriage broken by carnal fornication.' [EDITOR.]

(31.)—Most undoubtedly nothing can be so dreadful and pernicious as the remotest assent to, or connivance at, any part of *idolatry*. An avowed abhorrence of every thing relating to it, and an heartfelt manifestation of a deep sense of its abomination, is the duty of every servant of God, and especially of any Christian, who is at any time, to investigate such matters.—*King's Munimenta Antiqua*.

(32.)—The guilt and ruinous consequences of taking part in *idolatry*, do not indeed strike the imagination of the man of the world, however sagacious and discriminating his judgment may be in estimating the comparative malignity of the gross evils which strike his senses ; but to the man who is a Christian, not in name, but in reality, and who does not treat as the veriest fables the clearest declarations of the word of God, they rise into infinite importance, both as they respect the prosperity of nations, and the eternal welfare of the individuals of whom nations are composed.—*The Record*. May 14, 1838.¹

(33.) . . . Nothing seems to me so flagrantly unscriptural as the adoration of the image of the Virgin, and the trust reposed in her by the great mass of the people. I conceive this idolatry to be much more displeasing in the sight of God than the worship of the queen of heaven, so vehemently reprobated by the prophet

¹ The four first extracts under the head of Idolatry are brought forward in order to show the heinous character of this sin, and the evil consequences of conniving at it.—[EDITOR.]

Jeremiah, or the prostration of the pagans before their idols, which St. Paul and the other apostles so indignantly condemned. Indeed, when I think of the peculiar jealousy of the infinitely glorious Jehovah on the subject of any approach to idolatry, I see in this one feature of popery, the infallible mark of an open apostasy from the faith. The extraordinary fondness of the people for this worst part of their creed, only increases this conviction in my mind.¹—*Wilson's Letters from an Absent Brother*, Vol. ii. p. 14.

(34.) . . . But as idolatry, (spiritual fornication) is the head and front of her offences, and it is that sin for which, of all others, we have inspired authority for anticipating the severest vengeance of heaven ; and which is the most distinct characteristic of the predicted apostasy ; as nevertheless, the Church of Rome endeavours to evade the charge by explaining her image-worship as a merely representative and commemorative system, a few moment's attention to this point may be required. So early did the systems of idolatry develope themselves in the Roman Church, that instead of a novelty, they may be in some sort

¹ The Virgin Mary is beyond all comparison more adored than the ever-blessed God—the worship paid to her is universal in all places, and by all people. After the VIRGIN, some of the principal SAINTS seem to be the most worshipped ; then our SAVIOUR ; and lastly God, our heavenly FATHER. 'Shocking as this may appear,' proceeds the writer from whom I quote, (Rome in the 19th century,) 'it is too true. I am sure I do not exaggerate when I say, that throughout Italy, Spain, Portugal, and every country where the Catholic is the exclusive religion of the people, for one knee bent to God, thousands are bowed before the shrines of the Virgin and the Saints.'—*Rev. D. Wilson's Letters from an Absent Brother*. 3rd Ed. Vol. II. p. 14.

regarded as the continuation, or at the least, the very early revival under a new form, of the inveterate usages of Paganism. No sooner had imperial authority declared Christianity to be the religion of the state, than worldly views rather than sincere conversion, brought numerous adherents to her communion; and the compromising policy of the Roman bishops led them in some measure to indulge those heathen predilections for visible objects of worship which they could not wholly eradicate. The sacred cross, the tombs and relics of martyrs, the pictures and images of apostles and saints, gradually became objects of religious veneration; the veneration thus naturally excited, insensibly advanced to actual worship; and the simplicity of primitive piety, the reasonable and spiritual service of the Almighty Creator and Redeemer, and Sanctifier of mankind, was superseded by the invocation of saints, accompanied, no doubt, in the vulgar mind, with as abject an homage to their images of wood and stone, as ever was paid to the idols of Paganism.

In fact, independently of the connexion between Pagan and Popish idolatry observable in this particular case, it is by no means easy to trace the moral discrimination between them, either in their origin or in their effects. The hero of heathen antiquity and the Romish saint, arrived at the honours of worship by a process completely similar; and the excuse of a merely commemorative intention is quite as reasonable in the one case as in the other. The educated Pagan was not likely to have confounded the image with the absolute deity any more than the Papist himself. But who, under either system, shall limit the tendencies of popular superstition; of that tendency chiefly by which the visible image insensibly supersedes, in the

estimation of the ordinary worshipper, the being whom it is supposed to represent. For without some idea of peculiar sanctity attached to an image, as such, how shall we account for the crowds of pilgrims who flock to certain favourite shrines of the Virgin or other saints, when the presumed object of their mistaken devotion might have been worshipped without toil or expense at home ?

He who " knoweth what is in man," has prohibited the " graven image," not of false gods alone, but of the one true God himself;¹ there is neither exception nor reserve even for the image of the incarnate word. Will it then be credited by any one not already cognizant of the fact, that the crucifix, the effective engine, the notorious emblem of Romish superstition, is once more becoming, with some professed Protestants, an object, not indeed of worship, scarcely let us hope even of reverence, yet at least of religious interest. " The beginning" as " of strife," so of every other evil, " is as when one letteth out water." It is an experiment full of fearful hazard, yea, rather of awful presumption. Pride, the primeval curse of man's race, still pursues him. God issues a prohibition; man comprehends not its reason or its purpose; he longs for clearer apprehensions of things unseen; it is a thing " to be desired to make one wise." Vain man would be wiser than his God.

Idolatry, then, *the leading characteristic of religious apostasy*, was widely prevalent in the Roman church, at least as early as the sixth and seventh centuries ;

¹ " Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves ; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire, lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female." Deut. iv. 15, 16.

and in the eighth the conscientious, though unsuccessful, opposition of the eastern emperors only served to confirm its uncontrolled dominion; while the corrupt decrees of the second Nicene council invested it with the high sanction of acknowledged authority. The whole train of superstitions and abuses now followed in rapid succession; monastic austerities, clerical celibacy, the systematic imposture of pretended miracles, the portentous delusions of purgatory and transubstantiation, and the especial worship of the Virgin Mary; in short, almost all the well known attributes of Popery attained their full developement in the eleventh century; and even at this early period had aroused the first display of that strenuous opposition, which, afterwards designated by the name of Protestantism, has ever since resisted her pretensions.—*Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, May 1838, by Dr. Faussett, Professor of Divinity, p. 28.*

(35.)—There is the strongest reason for believing, that as Judea was chosen for the especial guardianship of the original revelation; so has England been chosen for the especial guardianship of Christianity.

The original revelation declared the one true God; Paganism was its corruption, by substituting many false gods for the true. The second revelation, Christianity, declared the one true Mediator; Popery was its corruption, by substituting many false mediators for the true. Both Paganism and Popery adopted the same visible sign of corruption, *the worship of images.*

The Jewish history opens to us a view of the acting of providence with a people appointed to the preservation of the faith of God. Every tendency to receive the surrounding idolatries into a participation of the

honours of the true worship, every idolatrous touch was visited with punishment, and that punishment not left to the remote working of the corruption, but immediate, and, by its directness, evidently designed to make the nation feel the high importance of the trust, and the final ruin that must follow its betrayal.

A glance at the British history since the Reformation, is enough to show how closely this providential system has been exemplified in England. Every reign which attempted to bring back Popery, or even to give it that share of power which could in any degree prejudice Protestantism, has been marked by signal misfortune. It is a striking circumstance that almost every reign of this Popish tendency has been followed by one purely Protestant ; and, as if to make the source of the national peril plain to all eyes, those alternate reigns have not offered a stronger contrast in their principles than in their public fortunes. Let the rank of England be what it might under the Protestant sovereign, it always sank under the Popish ; let its loss of honour, or of power, be what it might, under the Popish sovereign, it always recovered under the Protestant, and more than recovered ; was distinguished by sudden success, public renovation, and increased stability to the freedom and fortunes of the empire.—*Rev. G. Croly's Interpretation of the Apocalypse of St. John. Preface, p. i—iii.*

(36.)—A. D. 533. . . . A peculiar homage to the Virgin Mary had been for some time growing up in the east ; it had at length approached to divine worship, and the Virgin was named ‘ *The Mother of*

*God!*¹ Nestorius, a Syrian bishop, distinguished for learning and eloquence, fearlessly pronounced the doctrine impious; and, even in the hearing of the palace, declared that the Virgin Mary was but the mother of Christ in the human nature; and that the divine nature, however mysteriously joined to it, could, as God, neither be born nor die. . . .

A. D. 726. Two paramount doctrines, which would have struck the apostolic age with astonishment, have long distinguished the creed of Rome. They are the pillars of her throne. On the worship of the Virgin and the saints was already raised the spiritual supremacy; on the worship of images was now to be raised the temporal. Idolatry had rapidly spread through Christendom, in the ignorance and superstition of a time of relaxed church discipline and civil disorder. Its worship was expressed in the strongest language that man can use to Deity. ‘How shall we,’ is the Byzantine hymn to a supposed picture of Christ, ‘contemplate *this image* whose celestial splendour the *host of heaven* presumes not to behold. He who dwells in heaven condescends to visit us this day by his venerable image. He who is seated on the cherubim visits us this day by a picture, which the Father *has delineated with his immaculate hand*, which he has formed in an ineffable manner, and which we sanctify by *adoring it with fear and love.*’

This picture, “not made with hands, *ἀ εἰροποιητος*,” the visible creation of the Almighty, was declared to have already wrought miracles, and saved the city of Edessa from an assault by the Saracens.²

¹ The Rev. J. H. Newman in his Sermons applies this blasphemous and popish title to the Virgin Mary. [Editor.]

² It is appalling to find even in our own day, in the midst of disavowals of idolatry, and with Protestantism before their eyes,

... In the Jewish code, idolatry was declared to be the sin of sins, the most direct offence to that God who claims the undivided homage of the heart, the most open evidence of the alienation of man, the great peculiar crime which smote beyond the criminal, and tainted the blood of posterity. No evasion was suffered in either the degree of the worship, or the form of the image. The people were forbidden to "*bow down or serve,*" and they were equally forbidden to take their graven image from any object in the worlds of matter or mind. Earth and heaven—nature, and the imagination of those glorious shapes that inhabit immortality, were alike closed upon them. Neither the sacred animal of the Egyptian, the Greek demigod, the Syrian star-worship, nor the Indian emblems of the attributes, though all familiar to the knowledge of the Jew, were endured by the divine law. The purpose of Judaism was, to preserve the

the Romish priesthood using, almost word for word, the idolatrous language of the Byzantine hymn. In the 'History of the winking of the Virgin's eyes,' the famous Ancona miracle in 1796, the Abbe Albertini thus follows his model. 'The angels, which is the height of the Empyrean, profoundly venerate their eminent *Sovereign* (the Virgin), those angels, to whom it is not allowed to see her face, Anconitons, almost envy your good fortune.—It was Jesus Christ who first conceived the idea of this miracle. He thus addressed his mother. Go, O Reconciler, and *Mediator* between God and man, whom thou hast *vanquished*. *I have placed thee in the seat of my power*. It is by *thy intervention* that I bestow mercy. As thou hast given me the essence of man, so I give thee the *essence of God*, my omnipotence, by which *thou canst save* from punishment *all who recommend themselves to thee !*'

Pope Pius the VIIth. authenticated this abomination by crowning the picture, May 13, 1814, annexing to it a plenary indulgence for the remission of sins, and appointing the second *Sunday* in May for its annual holiday !

knowledge of the true God among men. But the preservation of that knowledge was so incompatible with image-worship, that its slightest touch was declared to be national pollution. The ruin of the idol priests and altars constituted the merit of kings; the toleration was their downfall; the national perversion, which still dared to adopt the rites of the neighbouring states, was visited with a succession of tremendous and predicted calamities, wound up in that seventy years captivity, which gave the Jews into the hands of a barbarian, left their temple in dust, and broke them down from the ancient and illustrious kingdom of David and Solomon into the trembling dependency, which one consummate crime more was to extinguish by the sword of Rome.

But there is no wilfulness in the divine prohibitions of idolatry. The evil grows out of no mere positive law; which yet the Lord of our being must have a right to impose at his pleasure; the natural effects of image-worship are impurity and impiety.

... Another unanswerable charge lies against all image-worship. It gives an untrue representation; a picture or a statue cannot realize the form of Deity. It gives a humiliating one; matter for spirit, lifelessness for essential activity; feeble, earthly locality for that Infinite Presence, which the heaven, and the heaven of heavens, cannot contain.

But the evil is more than negative. It is the course of human weakness to substitute the seen for the unseen. The statue rapidly supersedes the God. Yet, let the worshipper's veneration be what it will, he cannot escape the consciousness that the thing to which he kneels is a stock or stone. If such be the Deity, what must be the religion. Deification will be as easy as the erection of a statue. The superstitious

will deify their dreams, the profligate their passions, the timid and ignorant their fears and follies. Thus the ancient Romans raised altars to beings of notorious fable, and to actual impurity. The modern, often on the strength of the same legend, offers to the same image ; the African fabricates a devil, and bows down.

From this the course is precipitate to the deepest religious corruption. Multiplied statues involve multiplied shrines, ceremonies, and priests ; number produces competition ; popularity is purchased by artifice ; increased pomp of ceremonial, more dexterous legend, or bolder miracle. There is at this hour scarcely a church in Italy that has not its favourite saint, its wonder-working relic, and its chronicle crowded with the achievements of both. The rivalry is urged on, until the land is covered with idols, or partitioned into sacred principalities, within whose bounds the reigning saint admits of no division of power. What is the God of heaven and earth at Naples in the presence of St. Januarius, at Palermo in the presence of St. Rosolin, at Loretto in the presence of the Virgin, at Rome in the presence of St. Peter ! In this struggle of hypocrisy and ambition, the scriptures are, of necessity forgotten, or suppressed as a dangerous testimony ; the simple fervour and unworldly wisdom of religion are trampled down in the general bustle of the passions ; and the system issues forth armed and accomplished, in the perfect evil of idolatry ; tradition for scripture ; ritual for virtue ; Atheism for Christianity ; for the authentic and necessary ministers of the faith, a boundless priesthood, nurtured in fatal ignorance, or indolent and luxurious corruption, soliciting the favour of the populace by relaxing the obligations of the divine law ; the ready tools of zealotry and persecution, having an

original and vital interest in suppressing the progress of truth; preachers of blind submission, and artificers of productive imposture.

The representative adoration of Popery was the express worship of the Pagans. 'Statues are worshipped,' says Arnobius, 'not that the gold or silver, or similar material of the images are gods, but because through them, the invisible gods are honoured and worshipped.' And this was unquestionably the impression of the higher and thinking classes of Paganism. Yet against the whole image-worship, the apostles contended, not less vehemently than the Jewish lawgiver, declaring it in all its shapes an abomination, a demon-worship, and infecting even those who merely ate of the sacrifice with the guilt of rebellion against heaven.'—*Ibid.* p. 337—351.

(37.) About the year 727, the Greek emperor began open hostility with the bishop of Rome, and to use the words of Sigonius, (Sigon. Hist. de Regn. Italic, B. III.) Rome and the Roman dukedom passed from the Greek to the Roman bishop. It would have been more accurate to say, that a foundation was then laid for the temporal power of that prelate, than that it was actually established. However, as it was established a few years after, and a rupture commenced at the period just mentioned, I shall assume this as the most proper date that I know of for the beginning of the popedom, which from this time is to be regarded as Antichrist indeed; for it set itself by temporal power to support false doctrine, and particularly that, which deserves the name of *idolatry*.

The marvellous propensity of all ages to the sin of *idolatry*, which implies a departure of the heart from

the one living and true God, must originate in some steady principles existing in the nature of fallen man. The true account of this extraordinary and lamentable fact seems to be as follows :—God is an immaterial self-existent being, of infinite power and goodness, and, as our maker and preserver, he has an unquestionable claim to our supreme veneration and affection. Man, considered as a rational creature, is endowed with faculties abundantly sufficient for the discovery of this great and perfect being, so far as his own duties and interests are concerned. This has frequently been proved by able moralists, in the way of argument, and is expressly affirmed to be the case by St. Paul, in the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans, where it is said, that that which may be known of God is manifest in them, &c.

In fact, however, fallen man has never, by the mere use of his reason, found out God to any good purpose, and worshipped him accordingly; and even when God, by special revelation has condescended to explain and manifest his true character to a particular people, few of that people have served him as they ought to have done for any great length of time, but they soon corrupted the divine religion, and were plunged in idolatry.

The Jehovah of the sacred writings, and the Almighty and all-perfect God, who may be discovered by sound reason, is an invisible being, and is to be honoured, as a spirit, with the heart and the understanding, and without the intervention of sensible objects, as stocks or stones. “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul.” But the history of our corrupted nature shows, that images and other sensible objects have, in all ages, offered themselves to men’s minds as guides and helps to a conception of

the Deity ; and if, in some instances, these absurd inventions of gross idolatry have been rejected by men of learning and refinement, it has then generally happened, that intellectual figments of philosophical vanity have been substituted in their place, figments still more atheistical in their nature, and farther removed from the notion of a wise and authoritative governor of the universe, who enjoins the submission and dependence of his creatures, requires their obedience, and dispenses justice impartially.

The principles which appear to account for this apostasy, and opposition to the divine will, may be comprehended under the terms pride, self-love, self-righteousness, and desire of independence ; or indeed, under the single term pride alone, if we use that expression according to its most extensive application. Fallen man is too proud, practically, to feel and confess his relative ignorance and inanity, when compared with the supreme author of all things ; and the same principle prevents him from placing his supreme regard and esteem on God, though reason dictates, and revelation commands this duty. He loves himself and his own gratifications too well. Then it is easy to understand that pride and self-righteousness are nearly synonymous expressions ; a proud being will never esteem his own " righteousness as filthy rags," (Isaiah lxiv. 6.) will never cordially beg for pardon of his sins : he has too good an opinion of his own labours, inventions, and performances ; in a word, he is self-righteous ; and in a similar way it is plain, that the same being will aim at independence, and be impatient of control. In such a dangerous and corrupt state of human affections, the broad and crowded road to idolatry, which is the object we are seeking, is not difficult to be traced. For, whether we con-

sider pride as a comprehensive principle evolving itself, according to the explanation just given, in various mischievous operations, or whether we choose to confine the meaning of the term, no one will doubt, but that in fact, mankind in all ages have been grievously wanting in humility, have proudly set themselves up against God, have been actuated by inordinate self-love, and not submitting to the righteousness of God, and impatient of control, have endeavoured to establish their own righteousness. The existence of these principles and inclinations implies an absolute departure of the heart from the living God ; and when that has once taken place through the action of some steady cause, the progress to idolatry, or to some species of atheism, nearly allied to idolatry, is the next step. Man has departed from the true God, and there must be some device to quiet conscience. Thus in rude and barbarous times, the proud self-righteous devotee will naturally have recourse to the sottish invention of the worship of wood, or stone, or metals, and become a gross idolater. He will burn part of the wood with fire, and of the rest he will make a god, and kneel before it. The discovery mightily pleases him : he has found out a god, exactly suited to his taste ; a god who will easily pardon his vices, set a high value on his imagined virtues, and be constantly propitious to him ; a god who is not a universal governor or benefactor, but who is particularly kind to himself and his countrymen ; a god whom he can see and handle, and in whom he may pride himself, as having contrived and finished it with the tongs and hammer, or with the plane and compass ; a god who is local and tutelar, and over which he himself has considerable power : he can place it in his temple, in his chamber, or in the camp.

The ancient idolaters, by their images, often represented deceased chiefs, or heroes, or kings, who were still supposed to possess a superintending influence over the affairs of men; and not unfrequently these departed beings appear to have ranked among the most wicked of mankind. In more modern times, even Christianity itself has been disgraced with the adoration of images, representations, and relics of saints; nor has the abominable superstition always sufficiently taken care, that the supposed saints themselves should be reputable characters.

. . . The species of idolatry are exceedingly various; but they differ not much either in their source or their tendency. In all circumstances, man is miserable and blind, if he be not seeking and worshipping the true God in spirit and truth. If, in breach of the second commandment, he represent the glory of Jehovah by images, or if, in breach of the first he set up a divinity opposite to Jehovah, in both cases he forms a deceitful basis for salvation and happiness, and directly affronts the perfections of God. Such practices are, therefore, forbidden throughout the Scripture, in the most positive manner.

The guilt of idolatry, though no sin is so much spoken against throughout the Old Testament, is not so offensive to natural conscience as that of crimes committed against our fellow-creatures. Many persons are apt to wonder why the Israelites were so prone to it; not considering nor knowing their own idolatry, which works in a way more suited to present times and circumstances. But whoever understands that idolatry implies the departure of the heart from the living God, and the fixing of it on something else; that to distrust his word, and to put confidence in some sensible object by which we would represent him to our minds,

still further, that to glory in our own strength and righteousness, instead of seeking salvation by grace through faith only, proceeds from pride, and pours all possible contempt on the divine majesty, will not wonder at God's indignation against this sin, will see how naturally it operates on the human mind, and how it affords a complete demonstration of the apostasy of man.

The ancient church of God were distinguished from the nations all around, by the most express prohibitions of this sin. They were directed not to worship any but the living God, nor even Jehovah himself by any image whatever, much less were they allowed to worship any creature by representations, which would be to break the two first commandments by the same act. He, who knows the propensity of his own heart to distrust the providence and grace of God, and how eagerly we catch at any human relief, instead of patiently waiting upon God in trouble, will not wonder that the Israelites worshipped the calf in the absence of Moses, nor think the sin small because they intended to honour Jehovah by the symbol.

Under the Gospel dispensation the prohibition of images continued, and, in the purest times, there was little occasion to dwell on the subject. God in Christ was worshipped in spirit and in truth, by the primitive Christians: and while they called on the gentiles to turn from their idols to the living God, idolatry itself, in any of its forms, could scarcely find a shadow of admission into the Christian church. For, while men's hearts were filled with peace and joy in believing, while the doctrines of justification and regeneration were precious and all-important in their eyes, and they lived by the faith of Jesus, saw his glory, and felt in their souls the transforming power of his grace, the

deceitful aids of idolatry had no charms. It was not till the knowledge of the Gospel itself was darkened and adulterated, that the miserable spirits of men had recourse to such vain refuges, and that the mind, no longer under the influence of the Holy Spirit, betook itself to the arts of sculpture and painting, in order to inflame its affections, and to kindle a false fire of devotion. Christians then worshipped the true God with the understanding, and whoever was converted to the faith, ceased from idolatry. And, as we have seen, Christian emperors, particularly Theodosius, destroyed image-worship in their dominions. Origen, in his *Treatise against Celsus*, observes that it is not possible that any, by worshipping images, should attain the knowledge of God. Athanasius and Lactantius¹ strongly inculcate the same truth. Toward the end of the fourth century, some approach toward this evil appeared in the church. Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, observes that he found a linen cloth hanging on the church door, painted, and having on it the image of Christ, or of some saint. ‘Observing this,’ says he, ‘so contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, I tore the cloth.’ The famous Jerome published, in Latin, an epistle of Epiphanius concerning this subject, and added his own testimony on the point. So evident is it, that at that time images were absolutely prohibited in the Church of Christ. Augustine also gave his opinion against images. ‘They are of more

¹ In the three Homilies of the Church of England against peril of idolatry, the controversy is handled with much solidity and historical information. I have made some use of them for my purpose. It seems proper that every Protestant divine should acquaint himself with the fundamentals of the controversy, and be able satisfactorily to convince himself, that Popery is not, what it pretends to be, founded on the precedents of Christian antiquity.

force to pervert the soul, than to instruct it.' And 'when images are once placed in temples, and had in honour, error creepeth in.' Men, however, who had been lately turned from idols, began at length to paint or carve images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the apostles. Jerome observes, that the errors of images passed to Christians from the gentiles; and Eusebius, the historian, says, that images of Peter and Paul, and of our Saviour himself, were made in his time, which he took 'to be a heathenish custom.' They were not, however, worshipped, nor publicly set up in churches. Paulinus, who died bishop of Nola in the year 431, caused the walls of a temple to be painted with stories taken from the Old Testament, that the people might thence receive instruction: the written word was neglected, and these poor substitutes were placed in its room. A strong sign of the growing ignorance! As the ignorance increased, these historical paintings and images increased also. Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, because of the danger of idolatry, brake to pieces the images then set up in the churches. I have already noticed the imprudent concession made by Gregory, bishop of Rome, on this occasion, to the growing superstition. Thus, six hundred years after Christ, images had begun to appear in churches, but still without idolatry. The authority of Gregory, however, had evil consequences: the spirit of idolatry grew stronger, as real spiritual knowledge decayed; and men having now, in a great measure, lost the divine way of applying to God through Christ, by faith, for the relief of their consciences, became still more prone to rely on idols. So closely connected is the doctrine of justification with purity of worship. In this respect the Roman church advanced in corruption more rapidly than the eastern. And Grecian emper-

rors employed themselves in destroying images and pictures, while in Italy they were held in idolatrous admiration. The evil, in truth, became incurable, because there was no clear and effectual knowledge of the Gospel, that might dissipate the clouds of error. Yet were men's opinions divided both in the east and the west; and at length the crisis arose, when the Christian world was formally broken into two parties on this question. We are now advanced to the year 727, when Leo, the Isaurian, the Greek emperor, began openly to oppose the worship of images, and produced the rupture with the Roman See, before mentioned. A Syrian born of Christian parents, named Beser, who had been taken by the Mahometans, and afterwards returned to the Romans, had imbibed an opinion of the unlawfulness of the practice, having very probably observed the advantage which it had given to the infidels. He was in great favour with the emperor, and convinced him by his arguments, that image-worship was idolatrous. But the most eminent defender of the purity of divine worship in this point, and whom Fleury therefore in his popish zeal, calls the author of the heresy, was Constantine, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia. Convinced in his judgment, and zealous to propagate what appeared to him to be right, Leo assembled the people, and with the frankness and sincerity which mark his character, publicly avowed his conviction of the idolatry of the growing practice, and declared that images ought not to be erected for adoration.

Such a declaration in the sixth century would have raised no ferment in Christendom, but idolatry had been gradually advancing as the simplicity and purity of Christian faith had decayed. Men of no religious solicitude naturally conformed themselves to the

habits of the times ; persons who had some concern for the soul had been so long trammelled in a variety of superstitions for the relief of conscience, and the true relief of Christ's atonement was so little understood and relished, that the emperor was evidently in the minority through the Christian world. As yet no synods had given a sanction to image-worship. Precedents of antiquity were entirely against it. The word of God, which ought to have influenced the minds of men infinitely more than either, was in full opposition to the practice ; but so deeply had error prevailed ; so convenient did wicked men find it to commute for the indulgence of their crimes, by a zealous attachment to the idolatrous externals ; and so little was the scripture then read or studied, that the subjects of Leo murmured against him, as a tyrant and a persecutor. Even Germanus, the bishop of Constantinople, with equal zeal and ignorance, asserted that images had always been used in the church, and declared his determination to oppose the emperor at all events. It is not necessary to give a detail of the paltry evasions, and frivolous arguments, with which he endeavoured to support the idolatry. Desirous, however, of strengthening himself against the emperor, he wrote to the bishop of Rome, who warmly supported the same cause, and by reasonings of the same nature. Never was a more instructive lesson given to pastors, to teach the word of God in simplicity and faithfulness. Conscience will be disquieted at times, in men not altogether given up to a reprobate mind ; and, if peace by Jesus Christ through faith alone, be not steadfastly preached, men distressed for their sins will flee to idolatry with all their might, which will give them a false peace, and confirm them in sinful practices. By the knowledge of Christ crucified alone

can we be brought to a sound peace of conscience, and be constrained effectually to serve God and our neighbour in love. We have often, in the course of this history, seen this connection of sound doctrine and holy practice, and we are now stating the reverse of the picture. Nor can the spirit and principles of those Christians, who supported divine truth in the world, be so clearly understood without some knowledge of the real grounds of popery.

He who filled the Roman See at this time was Gregory the second, whom for his open defence and support of idolatry, I shall venture to call the first POPE of Rome. Many superstitions and abuses had been growing; and since the decease of Gregory I. I have for the most part been silent concerning the Roman bishops, because very little of godliness appeared among them. The most honourable part of their conduct related to the encouragement of missions, and the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles; in which, many who were actuated by the same spirit as those who had been sent by Gregory I. were successful in their provinces; and pure religion, in the fundamentals, at least, was extended into distant regions, while Rome and Italy grew more and more corrupt. The open avowal, however, of idolatry, was reserved for Gregory II. and from this time I look on the bishops of Rome as antichrist.

Rebellion trod on the heels of idolatry. Greece and its neighbouring islands opposed the emperor, and set up an usurper; so infatuated were men with image-worship. But the rebels were routed; and the usurper was taken and beheaded.

. . . In the year 730, Leo published an edict against images, and after having in vain endeavoured to bring over Germanus to his views, he deposed him, and set

up Anastasius in his room, who supported the emperor. There was a porch in the palace of Constantinople, in which was an image of Christ on the cross. Leo, who saw that it had been made an engine of idolatry, sent an officer to pull it down. Some women, who were there, intreated that it might be spared, but in vain. The officer mounted a ladder, and struck three blows with a hatchet on the face of the figure, when the women threw him down by pulling away the ladder, and murdered him on the spot : ¹ however the image was pulled down and burnt, and a plain cross was set up in its room ; for Leo only objected to the erection of a human figure. The women afterwards insulted Anastasius, as having profaned holy things. Leo put several persons to death, who had been concerned in the murder, and, such was the triumph of idolatry at length, that the murderers are honoured as martyrs by the Greek church to this day ! More blood was spilt on the occasion, partly through the vehemence of the emperor, and partly through the vehemence of the idolaters.

The news flew to Rome, where the same rage for idolatry prevailed, and the emperor's statues were pulled down, and trodden under foot. Italy was thrown into confusion ; serious attempts were made to elect another emperor ; and the Pope encouraged these attempts. He also prohibited the Italians from pay-

¹ This first instance of idolatrous zeal which occurs in Christendom, shews that the worshippers of images naturally connect the idea of sanctity with the wood or stone, and therefore the charge of literally worshipping inanimate matter, which the scriptures make against pagan idolaters, is just when applied to popish idolaters. By an induction from particulars, it were easy to prove, that the cases are similar, and, that futile distinctions and evasions may equally be applied to both, to cover and soften what cannot be vindicated in either.

ing tribute to Leo any longer, say the Greek writers, and some of the partizans of the Roman See, while the French writers represent him as endeavouring to quell the rebellion. It is difficult to give a fair statement of Gregory's conduct on this occasion; certain it is, that his obstinate defence of idolatry actually fomented the rebellion; and in the end, established the temporal power of his successors on the ruins of the imperial authority. His conduct was indirectly rebellious, if it was not directly so; for he wrote to Anastasius, that if he did not return to the catholic faith, he should be deprived of his dignity. Gregory must have known that this was in effect, to oppose the emperor himself. This was one of the last acts of the Roman prelate. He was succeeded by Gregory III. who wrote to the emperor in these arrogant terms: 'Because you are unlearned and ignorant, we are obliged to write to you rude discourses, but full of sense and the word of God. We conjure you to quit your pride, and hear us with humility.—You say that we adore stones, walls, and boards. It is not so, my lord; but those symbols make us recollect the persons whose names they bear, and exalt our grovelling minds. We do not look upon them as gods;—but if it be the image of Jesus, we say, Lord help us. If it be the image of his mother, we say, pray to your Son to save us. If it be of a martyr, we say, St. Stephen pray for us.¹ We might, as having the power of St.

¹ From these specimens the reader may judge whether the pope or the emperor was better acquainted with scripture. A pagan philosopher would have defended Gentile idolatry much in the same manner; and the dependence, which both the pagan and the papist place on the image, demonstrates, that they imagine the power of the saint or demon to be intimately connected with the image which represents, as it were, the body, of which the object

Peter, pronounce punishments against you ; but as you have pronounced the curse upon yourself, let it stick to you.—You write to us to assemble a general council ; of which there is no need. Do you cease to persecute images, and all will be quiet. We fear not your threats ; for if we go a league from Rome, toward Campania, we are secure.’ Certainly this is the language of Antichrist supporting idolatry by pretences to infallibility, and despising both civil magistrates and ecclesiastical councils.

I cannot do justice to Leo because we have not his answers to the Pope. But perhaps the language of Gregory will enable the reader for himself to vindicate the emperor. It is not to be wondered at that Leo refused to have any further intercourse with the Roman prelate. In 732, Gregory in a council excommunicated all, who should remove or speak contemptuously of images. And Italy being now in a state of rebellion, Leo fitted out a fleet which he sent thither ; but it was wrecked in the Adriatic. He continued, however, to enforce his edict against images in the east while the patrons of the fashionable idolatry supported it by various sophisms. In all his conduct Gregory now acted like a temporal prince : he supported a rebellious duke against Luitprand, king of the Lombards, his master, and fearing the vengeance of the latter, he applied to Charles Martel, mayor of

of their worship is the soul, so justly do the scriptures describe idolatry as literally worshipping the works of their own hands, and the man of sin as worshipping demons. (1 Tim. iv.) Sophistry may evade, but it cannot confute. When men cease to hold the head, and to be satisfied with Christ as their all, they fall into these or similar errors. The heart, which feels not the want of the living God, as its proper nutriment, will feed on the ashes of idolatry.

the palace in France, offering to withdraw his obedience from the emperor, and give the consulship of Rome to Charles, if he would take him under his protection. Charles, however, by his wars with the Saracens was prevented from complying with the Pope's request. But he left his power and ambitious views to his son and successor Pepin. Charles, Gregory, and Leo, all died in the same year 741, and left to their successors the management of their respective views and contentions.

Constantine VI. surnamed Copronymus, inherited his father Leo's zeal against images: and, as both the east and the west were precipitating themselves into idolatry, hence neither of these princes have met with a fair and impartial historian. Meanwhile the Arabians persecuted the Christians with unrelenting barbarity in the east, while the real church of God was desolated on all sides, and suffered equally from enemies without and within her pale. Zachary was the next Pope after Gregory III. an aspiring politician, who fomented discord among the Lombards, and by his intrigues, obtained from their king Luitprand an addition to the patrimony of the church. The Roman prelates had ceased to worship God in spirit and in truth, and were now become mere secular princes.

Zachary showed how well he merited the title of a temporal governor. He had the address to preserve still a nominal subjection to the Greek emperor, while he seized all the power of the Roman dukedom for himself, and looked out for a protector both against his lawful sovereign and against the Lombards. This was Pepin, the son and successor of Charles Martel in France, who sent a case of conscience to be resolved by the Pope, namely, whether it would be just in himself to depose his sovereign Childeric III. and

to reign in his room ? Zachary was not ashamed to answer in the affirmative. Pepin then threw his master into a monastery, and assumed the title of king. Zachary died soon after, viz. in the year 752.

The Greek emperor was unable to cope with the subtilty of the Pope and the violence of the Lombards. Ravenna, the capital of his dominions in Italy, was taken by king Astulphus, who had succeeded Rachis, the successor of Luitprand. This government, called the Exarchate, had continued in Italy about 180 years. Stephen, the successor of Zachary, finding the superior strength of the Lombards, now solicited the aid of Constantine, who was too much employed in the east to send any forces into Italy. In the year 754, the emperor held a council of 338 bishops, to decide the controversy concerning images. They express themselves not improperly on the nature of the heresy. 'Jesus Christ,' say they 'hath delivered us from idolatry, and hath taught us to adore him in spirit and in truth. But the devil not being able to endure the beauty of the church, hath insensibly brought back idolatry, under the appearance of Christianity, persuading men to worship the creature, and to take for God a work to which they give the name of Jesus Christ.'

Reinforced by the decrees of this council against image-worship, Constantine burnt the images, and demolished the walls, which were painted with representations of Christ or the saints ; and seemed determined to exterminate all the vestiges of idolatry. In the meantime, in Italy, Stephen, pressed by the victorious arms of Astulphus, applied himself to Pepin, and wrote to all the French dukes, exhorting them to succour St. Peter, and promising them the remission of their sins, a hundred fold in this world, and in the

world to come life everlasting. So rapidly advanced the popedom ! A letter was now brought to the Pope from the emperor, ordering him to go to Astulphus, and demand the restitution of Ravenna. Superstition was every where so strong, that there was no danger incurred by such a step ; and the weakness of the emperor, and the distraction of his affairs, allowed him not to give any other sort of succour to Italy. Stephen sent to the king of the Lombards, to demand a pass. This was granted, and he set out from Rome, to go to Astulphus. A short time before he undertook this journey, messengers had arrived to him from Pepin, encouraging him to go along with them into France. Stephen arrived at Pavia, the capital of Lombardy, and after an ineffectual interview with the king, went into France, where Pepin treated him with all possible respect, and promised to undertake an expedition into Italy to relieve the Roman See.—Stephen anointed with oil the king of the Franks ; and by the authority of St. Peter, forbade the French lords, on pain of excommunication, to choose a king of another race.

Thus did these two ambitious men support one another in their schemes of rapacity and injustice. In the Pope the evil was aggravated by the pretence of religion. ‘ It is you,’ says Stephen, ‘ whom God hath chosen for this purpose by his prescience from all eternity. For whom he hath predestinated, them he also called ; and whom he called, them he also justified.’ It must be owned, that Stephen was fitter to conduct a negociation, than to expound a text.

Pepin attacked Astulphus so vigorously, that, in the end, he obliged him to deliver the Exarchate, that is, Ravenna, and twenty-one cities besides to the Pope. Constantine, alarmed at the danger of his dominions,

in Italy, sent an embassy to king Pepin, to press him to deliver the Exarchate to its rightful sovereign : but in vain. In the issue, the Pope became the proprietor of Ravenna and its dependencies, and added rapacity to his rebellion.

From this time he not only assumed the tone of infallibility and spiritual dominion, but became literally a temporal prince. On the death of Astulphus, Disiderius, Duke of Tuscany, in order to obtain the succession, promised Stephen, to deliver to him some other cities, which the Lombards had taken from the emperor Stephen, embraced the offer without hesitation, assisted Desiderius in his views, and obtained for the popedom the duchy of Ferrara, and two other fortresses. The injured emperor, in the meantime, continued to exterminate idolatry in the east ; but whether his motives were pious or not, our ignorance of his private character will not suffer us to ascertain. The ambitious and successful Stephen held the popedom five years, and died in 757. His successor, Paul, even before his appointment to that dignity, had taken care to cultivate the friendship, and secure the protection of Pepin. The maritime parts of Italy still obeyed the emperor, and these, together with the Lombards, threatened the Pope, from time to time, whence he was induced to write frequently to the king of France for assistance.

Constantine forbad every where the addressing of prayers to the Virgin Mary, or to other saints, and discountenanced the monks through his dominions. He is said to have treated the worshippers of images with great barbarity, and to have been profane and vicious in his own practice. But such censures were the natural and obvious effect of his conduct.

In the year 768 died Pepin, the great supporter of the

popedom. Its grandeur was, however, not yet arrived at maturity. Adrian, who was elected pope in 772, was not inferior to his predecessors in the arts of ambitious intrigue. He received the homage of Rieti and Spoleto, towns of Lombardy, and allowed them to choose a duke among themselves. Partly by these means, and still more by the powerful alliance of Charles, the son and successor of Pepin, commonly called Charlemagne, for his great exploits; he strengthened himself against the hostilities of king Desiderius. He received from the French king a confirmation of Pepin's donative of the Exarchate, with some considerable additions of territory. The friendship of ambitious men is cemented by views of interest. This was exactly the case of Charles and Adrian. In a superstitious age, the king derived from the sacred character of the pope the most substantial addition to his reputation, and was enabled to expel Desiderius entirely from his dominions. In the year 774, he assumed the title of king of France and Lombardy. The last king of the Lombards was sent into a monastery in France, where he ended his days. In the next year, the emperor Constantine died, after having vigorously opposed image-worship all his reign. At the same time also died the Mahometan Caliph Almansor, the founder of Bagdad, which from that time became the residence of the Saracen monarchs, whose empire then began to carry more the appearance of a regular government, and ceased to be so troublesome to the remains of the old Roman empire, as it had formerly been.

Leo, the son and successor of Constantine, trode in the steps of his father and grandfather, and exercised severities on the supporters of image-worship. But, as he died in the year 780, his wife Irene assumed

the government in the name of her son Constantine, who was only ten years old. She openly and zealously supported idolatry. The east was so eagerly addicted to it, that there wanted only the authority of a sovereign to render it triumphant. Images gained the ascendancy, and the monastic life, which either the piety or the prudence of three emperors, for I cannot ascertain their real character, had much discouraged, became again victorious in Greece and Asia.

In 784, Irene wrote to Adrian, desiring his presence at a council to be held for the support of image-worship, at least that he would send legates to it. Tarasius, bishop of Constantinople, just appointed and perfectly harmonizing with the views of the empress, wrote to the same purport. Adrian's answer is worthy of a pope. He expresses his joy at the prospect of the establishment of image-worship ; and at the same time, testifies his displeasure at the presumption of Tarasius, in calling himself universal patriarch : he demands the restoration of St. Peter's patrimony, which, during the schism, the emperors of Constantinople had withheld ; and sets before the empress the munificent pattern of Charlemagne, who had given to the Roman church, to be enjoyed for ever, provinces, cities, and castles, once in possession of the Lombards, but which of right belonged to St. Peter. Ambition and avarice were thus covered with the thin veil of superstition. But this was the age of clerical usurpations. Large domains were now commonly annexed, by superstitious princes, to the church, for the pardon of their sins ; but the pope was the greatest gainer by this traffic. That which is most to our purpose to observe, is the awful departure, which had commonly been made throughout Christendom, from the all-im-

portant article of justification. While this is firmly believed and revered, it is impossible for men to think of commuting for their offences with heaven; and it is itself the surest defence against clerical encroachments, superstition, idolatry, and hypocrisy. But the pulpits were silent on this doctrine: during this whole century, false religion grew without any check or molestation; and vices, both in public and private life, increased in proportion.

In the year 787, the second council of Nice was held under the empress: and of such a council it is sufficient to say, that it confirmed idolatrous worship. Pope Adrian, having received the acts of the council, sent them to Charlemagne, that he might procure the approbation of the bishops of the west. But here his expectations were disappointed. United in politics by the coincidence of interested views, they were however found to disagree in religious sentiments. Charlemagne, though illiterate himself, was one of the greatest patrons of learning: and if he may be supposed to have been in earnest in any opinions, he would naturally be much influenced by the famous Alcuin, an Englishman, whom he cherished and esteemed. The customs and habits of the west were far from universally favouring the reigning idolatry. I am anxiously looking for the features of the Church of Christ in this very gloomy period, and I conjecture that her existence was most probably to be found in the churches lately planted, or in those which were then in an infant state. Our own island was decidedly, at that time, hostile to idolatry. The British churches execrated the second council of Nice, and some even of the Italian bishops protested against the growing evil. Nor is it probable that the churches of Germany now forming, were at all disposed to receive it.

Men who first receive Christianity from zealous teachers, are simple and sincere, nor is it easy to convince an ingenuous person, that idolatry, however qualified or explained, is allowable on the plan of the Scriptures, either of the Old or New Testament. France itself had, as yet, shown no disposition positively in favour of idolatry. The Roman See alone, in Europe, had in form supported and defended it. And experience proves that the greatest stages of degeneracy are to be found in the churches which have subsisted the longest.

Charlemagne could not but be struck at the discordancy of the Nicene council with the habits of the west, and was therefore so far from receiving, with implicit faith, the recommendation of it by Pope Adrian, that he ordered the bishops of the west to examine the merits of the question. The issue was the publication of the Carolin books, in which the famous Alcuin had at least a distinguished share. In these the authors find fault with a former synod held in Greece, under Constantine, which forbade the use of images. For they held the dangerous opinion of Gregory I., namely, that these might be set up in churches, and serve as books for the instruction of the people. But they condemn, in very free terms, the late Grecian synod, which enjoined the worship of images. They find fault with the flattering addresses made by the Greek bishops to Pope Adrian. They allow the primacy of St. Peter's See, but are far from founding their faith on the pope's decrees. They condemn the worship of images by scriptural arguments by no means impertinent or contemptible. These, however, need not be repeated on the present occasion.

Engilbert, the ambassador of Charles, presented these books to Adrian. This ambitious politician who

subsisted by the protection of Charlemagne, and who was concerned to maintain the honours of his See, replied with great prudence. It is evident, from his whole conduct, that his object was the temporal interests of the popedom. Hence his answer to Charles was tame and insipid, and his defence of image-worship weak and inconclusive. Charles and the French churches persevered in their own middle practice: they used images, but they abhorred the adoration of them. In the year 794, at Frankfort upon the Maine, a synod was held, consisting of three hundred bishops, who condemned the second council of Nice, and the worship of images. In this synod, Paulinus, bishop of Aquileia, in Italy, bore some share. All his life, however, Adrian continued on good terms with Charlemagne. He died in the course of the next year, and was succeeded by Leo III. Political intrigue, and secular artifice, not theological study, was then the practice of Roman bishops. The Irish, at this time, particularly excelled in divinity, travelled through various countries, and became renowned for their learning; and the superior light exhibited by England and France in the controversy of images, seems to prove that these countries, in their knowledge of Scripture, and also in their regard for its doctrines, far exceeded Rome. Yet so strongly were men prejudiced in favour of the dignity of the Roman See, that it still remained in the height of its power, and was enabled in process of time to communicate its idolatrous abominations through Europe. In the east, the worship of images was triumphant, but as yet not universal.¹

¹ Irene, toward the close of this century, viz. about the year 797, dethroned her son Constantine, and put out his eyes with such violence, that he lost his life. This monster, a worthy

This chapter contains the narrative of the most fatal events which the church had ever seen. The Arian heresy had disfigured and deeply wounded her constitution, but she had recovered and confounded this adversary. The Pelagian poison had operated for a time ; but its detection and expulsion had even contributed to recover her health, and to restore her to a great degree of apostolical purity. Other heresies which affected the doctrine of the Trinity, had been successfully opposed ; superstition for a number of centuries had sullied her beauty, but had left her vitals untouched. Idolatry, at length, aided by the same superstitious propensity, prevailed to disunite her from Christ, her living head. The reigning powers, both in the east and the west, were overgrown with false worship : even those parts of the west, which as yet were not disposed to receive idolatry, were deeply prepared for the gradual admission of it, partly by the growing of superstition, and partly by the submission of all the European churches to the domination of the Roman See. There the seat of Antichrist was firmly fixed. Rebellion against the lawful power of the magistrate, the most arrogant claims to infallibility, and the support of image-worship, conspired with the temporal dominion lately obtained by the bishop of Rome, to render him the tyrant of the church. His dominions, indeed, were not large ; but, in conjunction with the proud pretensions of his ecclesiastical character, they gave him a superlative dignity in the eyes of all Europe. It was evident that the face of the whole church was altered : from the year 727, to about the year 2000 we have the dominion of the beast, (Rev. xi. and xiii.) and patroness of idolatry, then reigned alone, and co-operated with the pope of Rome, in the support of Satan's kingdom. She was deposed and banished by Nicephorus, A. D. 802.

the prophesying of the witnesses in sackcloth, which was to continue 1260 days, or forty and two months, that is, for 1260 years. We must now look for the real church, either in distinct individual saints, who, in the midst of popery, were preserved by effectual grace in vital union with the Son of God, or, in associations of true Christians, formed in different regions, which were in a state of persecution and much affliction. Where then was the church in the eighth century? She still subsisted; and the opposition made to idolatry by Charles and the council of Frankfort, demonstrates her existence. Nothing but the influence of principles very opposite to those which were fashionable at Rome can account for such events, at a time when the dignity of the Roman See was held in universal veneration. After all, it is in the propagation of the Gospel among the pagans, that the real church is chiefly to be seen in this century. Some real work of this kind was carrying on, while the popedom was forming; and, by the adorable Providence of God, pious missionaries, who entered not into the recent controversies, but were engaged in actions purely spiritual, were patronized and supported in preaching Christ among foreign nations by the same popes of Rome, who were opposing his grace in their own.¹ Their ambition led them to cherish the zeal of the

¹ Should any persons startle that I call image worship by no better name than idolatry, and rank pagan and papal practices in the same class, I would refer such to the censure of St. Paul on the Galatians, iv. 8, 9. Idolatry being with them merely mental, originated in a self-righteous principle, and the Apostle looks on them as worshippers of false gods, and informs them that they were returning again to bondage. How much more justly may image-worship be called 'the doing service to them which by nature are no gods,' where the idolatry is both mental and external.

missionaries, but with how different a spirit.—*Milner's Church History*. Vol. III. p. 146—171.

(38.)—Idolatry, in the Scriptural sense of the word, is of two sorts, and consists either—1. in giving the honour due to the one true God, as maker and governor of the world, to any other supposed, though subordinate god; or—2. in giving the honour due to Christ, as the sole mediator between God and man, to any other supposed, though subordinate mediator. The *former* is the idolatry forbidden by the Jewish law, and by the law of nature: The *latter* is Christian idolatry, properly so called, and is the abomination, prohibited and condemned, in so severe terms, by the law of the Gospel.

Now, whether the *former* species of idolatry be chargeable on the church of Rome or not; and whether the *crime* of that species, may not be incurred by honouring the true object of worship, through the medium of some sensible image: whatever, I say, be determined on these two points, which for the present, shall be set aside, the *other* species of idolatry is, without all doubt, chargeable on any Christian church that shall adopt or acknowledge, in its religious addresses, another mediator, besides Christ Jesus.

But the church of Rome, I do not say, in the private writings of her divines, but in the solemn forms of her ritual, *publickly professes*, and, by her canons and councils, *authoritatively enjoins*, the worship of saints and angels, under the idea of mediators and intercessors: not indeed in exclusion of Christ, as *one*, or if you will, as *chief* mediator, but in manifest defiance of his claim to be, the *sole* mediator. This charge is truly and justly brought against that church, as it now

stands, and hath stood, for many ages ; and cannot, by any subterfuge whatsoever, be evaded. And therefore to the other characters of Pride and Intolerance, which she takes to herself with much complacency, she must, now, be content, whether she will or no, to have that of *Dæmon-worship*, or *antichristian idolatry*, fastened upon her.

Nor let the followers of that communion think to elude this charge, by saying, that they only request the saints, as we commonly do any good man, to pray for them. False, and disingenuous ! *False*, because their breviaries and litanies shew, that they supplicate the saints to befriend them by their own inherent power, or to intercede for them to the throne of God by virtue of their own personal merits, in blasphemous derogation to the all-atoning and incommunicable intercession of Jesus. *Disingenuous*, too ; because they know very well, that the question is concerning unseen and heavenly mediators only, not men like ourselves, such as we live and converse with on earth ; whom we only admonish of their duty, and to whom we only do ours, when we call upon them to exert an act of piety and common charity in praying for their fellow-christians. Our meaning is but that which the Apostle well expresses, when he would have us *consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works* ; and not at all to supplicate our Christian brethren as powerful intercessors, in whose meritorious virtues we confide, and to whom, as possessing a proper interest in the Almighty, by the worth of their own persons, we commit our dearest concerns, the forgiveness of our sins, and the salvation of our souls.

But this, it will be said, is a very defective, and even unfair, account of the matter. We do more than admonish our brethren of their duty, when we solicit

their prayers for us. We invite them directly, and formally, to *intercede* for us to the throne of grace. We are allowed, nay even encouraged, to lay a stress on their intercessions, and what is more, we are given to understand that such intercession, especially if it be made by good men, will have weight and influence in heaven. What else is the meaning of the apostle, when he assures us, *that the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much*. And, if the prayer of a righteous man, much more the prayer of glorified saints and angels.

I have put the argument, I think, in all its force, and, because the advocates of the papal cause affect to think it unanswerable, shall examine it, with care. We apply to good Christians, or to those we esteem such, to intercede for us by their prayers to heaven. We do so; and are encouraged in this application, by the example, and by the directions of the apostles. For I shall not take advantage of what some have conceived to be the meaning of St. James, in the place alleged, where he attributes so much to the prayer of a righteous man, that the prayer there spoken of is *the prayer of faith*, or a spiritual gift miraculously conferred on the first teachers of the gospel, and confined to their ministry: I will not, I say, take advantage of this gloss; because whatever foundation it may seem to have in the context of that epistle, I allow it to be clear from other places of the New Testament, that the duty of Christians is to pray, that is, to *intercede*, for each other. But then I desire it may be observed,

1. What difference there is between desiring good men to pray for us, in the gospel sense of that duty; and desiring saints and angels to pray for us, in the sense of the papal rituals. We request those prayers,

only as they shall be offered up in the name, and through the merits, of the great, and properly speaking, sole intercessor; and we look for no effect from them but on that condition. The church of Rome addresses herself to saints and angels, as *intercessors*, by, what we may call, their own right, by virtue of their own inherent sanctity; or, rather, she applies to them directly, as to *saviours* for their proper and immediate help, and expects it from the supposed privilege of their rank, or merits, independently of their *prayers*, or at least, of the *manner* in which those prayers shall be presented through the name of Jesus. The formal words of their Litanies show, that such is their meaning. But they will say, that this condition of interceding, or saving, through the merits of Christ, is implied, though not expressed. I reply then,

2. That, admitting it to be so, there is yet the widest difference between *praying* to saints and angels to pray for us, though in the gospel forms of intercession; and merely *requesting* good men to pray for us, in those forms. The *latter* address is made in a way remote from all appearance of idolatry, and free from the suspicion of it; the *former* is preferred in the *place*, at the *time*, with the *posture*, in the *language*, in short, with all the circumstances and formalities of divine worship.

3. I observe, that, when we ask the prayers of men, we know that they hear our address to them; we cannot even suppose thus much of saints and angels, without ascribing to them the incommunicable attributes of the Almighty.

Still it may be insisted that prayers, whether offered up to God by man or glorified spirits, are however to be considered in the light of *intercessors*; and that therefore, so far as we combat the practice of saint-

worship on that ground, Protestants, as well as Papists, when they employ the prayers of others, are guilty of idolatry.

This in truth, is the hinge on which the question turns; and, to shew the difference of the two cases, palpably and clearly, I say,—

Fourthly, and lastly, that the gospel in permitting, or rather in commanding us to ask the prayers of each other, justifies this sort of intercession, and absolves it from the blame and guilt of idolatry. It gives a sanction in this mode of mediating with God by his saints, on earth; and does not regard it as a practice that interferes with the mediatorial office of Jesus in heaven.

The same gospel, on the contrary, I inquire not for what reason, says not a word, from which we can infer, that any such address is directed, or permitted, to be made to angels or spirits. It even condemns all addresses of this kind, under the opprobrious name of unauthorized, or *will-worship*. Though we be allowed then, to have good men, in some sense, for our mediators or intercessors on earth, we are not allowed to have any mediator or intercessor in the tabernacle of heaven, but Jesus, the great high priest of Christians only. This last sort of intercession, by angels and glorified saints, is against the spirit and letter of our religion. It is a practice, which, not being enjoined, is forbidden; which, being disallowed is reprobated. In a word, it entrenches on the incommunicable honour and prerogatives of the great, the appointed, the sole mediator in heaven, seated at God's right hand, *who ever liveth to make intercession for us*. It sets up new mediators, without, and against his leave; it is, then, un-christian and idolatrous.

Thus at length, I suppose, it appears indisputably,

that we are neither unreasonable, nor uncharitable, in charging IDOLATRY, as well as the other two anti-christian vices of pride and intolerance to the account of papal Rome.—*Bishop Hurd on the Prophecies.* 1772. p. 382—394.

(39.)—It seems to be the chief end of revealed religion to deliver the world from idolatry, a great part of the Mosaic law did consist of rites, of which we can give no other account, that is so like to be true, as that they were fences and hedges, that were intended to keep that nation in the greatest opposition, and at the utmost distance from idolatry: we cannot therefore think that in the Christian religion, in which we are carried to higher notions of God, and to a more spiritual way of worshipping him, there should be such an approach to some of the worst pieces of gentilism, that it seems to be outdone by Christians in some of its most scandalous parts, such as the worship of subordinate gods and of images.

These are the chief grounds upon which we separate from the Roman communion, since we cannot have fellowship with them, unless we will join in those acts, which we look on as direct violations of the First and Second commandments. God is a jealous God, and therefore we must rather venture on their wrath, how burning soever it may be, than on his, who is a consuming fire. *Bishop Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles.* Edited by Rev. J. R. Page, p. 332.

(40.)—The new dispensation does in all respects carry the ideas of God and of true religion much higher, and raises them much above those compliances

that were in the old, to men's senses, and to sensitive natures; and it would seem to contradict the whole design of it, if we could imagine that such things were allowed in it, which were so expressly forbidden in the old. Upon this occasion it is remarkable that the two fullest passages in the New Testament concerning images, are written upon the occasion of the most refined idolatry that was then in the world, which was at Athens. Acts xvii. 16, 24—29. Rom. i. 20—32.

. . . These two passages, the one of St. Paul's preaching, and the other of his writing, being both applied to those who had the finest speculations among the heathen, do evidently demonstrate how contrary the Christian doctrine is to the worshipping of images of all sorts, how speciously soever that may be disguised.

If these things wanted an explanation, we find it given us very fully in all the writings of the fathers during their disputes with the heathen. They do not only charge them with the false notions that they had of God, the many deities they worshipped, the absurd legends that they had concerning them; but in particular, they dwell long upon this of the worshipping of God in or by an image, with arguments taken both from the pure and spiritual nature of God, and from the plain revelation he made of his will in this matter. . . . Their reasonings are so clear and so full, that nothing can be more evident than that they condemned all the use of images in the worship of God, and yet both Celsus, Porphyry, Maximus, Tyrius, and Julian, told them very plainly, that they did not believe that the godhead was like their images, or was shut up within them; they only used them as helps to their imagination and apprehension, that from thence they might form suitable thoughts of the deity. This did

not satisfy the fathers, who insisted on it to the last, that all such images as were made the objects of worship were idols ; so that if in any thing we have a very full account of the sense of the whole church for the first four centuries, it is in this matter. They do not speak of it now and then only by the way, as in a digression, in which the heat of argument or of rhetoric, may be apt to carry men too far : they set themselves to treat of this argument very nicely, and they were engaged in it with philosophers, who were as good at subtleties and distinctions as other men.—*Ibid*, p. 305—307.

(41.) . . . We are not concerned to examine how it came that all this vigorous opposition to image-worship went off so soon. It is enough to us, that it was once made so resolutely ; let those who think it so incredible a thing, that churches should depart from their received traditions, answer this as they can. As for the methods then used, and the arguments that were then brought to infuse this doctrine into the world, he who will read the history and acts of the Nicene council, will find enough to incline him to a very bad opinion, both of the men, and of their doctrine, though he were ever so much inclined to think well of them. After all, though that council laid the foundation of image-worship, yet the Church of Rome has made great improvements in it since. Those of Nice expressed a detestation of an image made to represent the deity ; they go no higher than the images of Christ and the saints ; whereas since that time the Deity and the Trinity have been represented by images and pictures : and that not only by connivance, but by

authority in the church of Rome. Bellarmine, Suarez, and others, prove the lawfulness of such images, from the general practice of the church. Others go further, and from the caution given in the decree of the council of Trent concerning the images of God, do infer that they are allowed by that council, provided they be decently made. Directions are also given concerning the use of the image of the Trinity in public offices among them. In a word, all their late doctors agree that they are lawful, and reckon the calling that in question to be not only rashness, but an error; and such as have held it unlawful to make such images, were especially condemned at Rome, December 17, 1690. The varieties of those images, and the boldness of them, are things apt to give horror to modest minds, not accustomed to such attempts. It must be acknowledged, that the old emblematical images of the Egyptians, and the grosser ones now used by the Chinese, are much more instructing, and much less scandalous figures.

As the Roman church has gone beyond the Nicene council in the images that they allow of, so they have also gone beyond them in the degrees of the worship that they offer to them. At Nice the worship of images was very positively decreed, with anathemas against those who did it not: a bare honour they reckoned was not enough.

. . . It seemed necessary to say so much, to justify our church, which has in her Homilies laid this charge of idolatry very severely on the Church of Rome; and this is so high an imputation, that those who think it false, as they cannot, with a good conscience, subscribe, or require others to subscribe the article concerning the Homilies, so they ought to retract their own subscriptions, and to make solemn

reparations in justice and honour, for laying so heavy an imputation unjustly upon that whole communion.—*Ibid.* p. 310—313.

(42.)—The third head rejected in this Article (22nd) is the worshipping of images. Here those of the church of Rome complain much of the charge of idolatry, that our church has laid upon them, so fully and so severely in the Homilies. Some among ourselves have also thought that we must either renounce that charge, or that we must deny the possibility of salvation in that church, and in consequence to that conclude, that neither the baptism nor the orders of that church are valid : for since idolaters are excluded from the kingdom of heaven, they argue, that if there can be no salvation where idolatry is committed by the whole body of a church, then that can be no church, and in it there is no salvation.—*Ibid.* p. 301.

(43.)— . . . Since there are so many of the Homilies that charge the church of Rome with *idolatry*, and that from so many different topics, no man who thinks that church is not guilty of *idolatry*, can with a good conscience subscribe this Article, (the 35th,) that the Homilies ‘contain a good and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times ;’ for according to his sense they contain a false and an uncharitable charge of *idolatry* against a church that they think is not guilty of it ; and he will be apt to think that this was done to heighten the aversion of the nation to it : therefore any who have such favourable thoughts of the church of Rome, are bound, by the force of that persuasion of theirs not to sign this Article, but to declare

against it ; as the authorizing of an accusation against a church, which they think is ill-grounded, and is by consequence both unjust and uncharitable.

By ‘ necessary for these times,’ is not to be meant that this was a book fit to serve a turn ; but only that this book was necessary at that time to instruct the nation aright, and so was of great use then : but though the doctrine in it, if once true, must be always true, yet it will not be always of the same necessity to the people. As for instance, there are many discourses in the Epistles of the Apostles that relate to the controversies then on foot with the Judaizers, to the engagements the Christians then lived in with the heathens, and to those corrupters of Christianity that were in those days. Those doctrines were necessary for that time ; but though they are now as true as they were then, yet, since we have no commerce either with Jews or Gentiles, we cannot say that it is as necessary for the present time to dwell much on those matters, as it was, for that time to explain them once well. If the nation should come to be quite out of the danger of falling back into popery, it would not be so necessary to insist upon many of the subjects of the Homilies, as it was when they were first prepared.—*Ibid* p. 492.

(44.) . . . The Church of Rome teaches, that the substances of bread and wine are changed into ‘ the substance of the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and consequently the whole Christ ; and is therefore to be venerated with peculiar festive celebration, to be solemnly carried about in procession, to be publicly presented to the people for their adoration, and to be

adored even with the worship due to the true God.' Now all this rests upon the doctrine of transubstantiation; and if the doctrine of transubstantiation be not true, what opinion must be entertained of these acts of veneration for the sacrament which rest upon it? Let the reply be given in the unequivocal and unanswerable words of Bishop Burnet. 'This we believe is plain idolatry, when an insensible piece of matter, such as bread and wine, has divine honours paid it; when it is believed to be God, when it is called God, and is in all respects worshipped with the same adoration that is offered up to Almighty God. This we think is *gross idolatry*. Many writers of the Church of Rome have acknowledged, that, if transubstantiation is not true, their worship is a strain of idolatry beyond any that is practised among the most depraved of all the heathens.' Correspondent to this is the sentiment expressed by the Church of England, who repudiating the suspicion that by prescribing the posture of kneeling at the Holy Communion, she intended any adoration of the sacramental bread and wine, declares that 'the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.' The idolatry thus asserted is palpable upon the supposition that transubstantiation does not take place. But that transubstantiation does not take place, has been already shown; so that the horrible idolatry of the Romish church is manifest.

The Romish church indeed is indignant at the charge of idolatry, and anathematizes any one who alleges it against her. But wherein does her case differ from that of the idolaters of old? 'If,' says Bishop Burnet; 'the conceits that the ancient idolaters had both concerning their gods, and the idols that they worshipped,

will excuse from idolatry, it will be very hard to say that there were ever any idolaters in the world. Those who worshipped the sun thought that the great divinity was lodged there, as in a vehicle or temple ; but they were not, by reason of that misconception excused from being idolaters.' Nor does the opinion of the Church of Rome concerning the presence of Christ in the sacramental bread and wine excuse her from the like charge. *Romanism and Scripture compared by Bishop Mant.* p. 28.

(45). . . The Scriptures of the Old Testament condemning and abhorring as well all *idolatry* or worshipping of images, as also the very idols or images themselves, especially in temples, are so many and plentiful, that it were almost an infinite work, and to be contained in no small volume, to record all the places concerning the same. For when God had chosen to himself a peculiar and special people from amongst all other nations that knew not God but worshipped idols and false gods, he gave unto them certain ordinances and laws to be kept and observed of his said people. But concerning none other matter did he give either more, or more earnest and express laws to his said people, than those that concerned the true worshipping of him, and the avoiding and fleeing of idols, and images, and idolatry : for that both the said idolatry is most repugnant to the right worshipping of him and his true glory, above all other vices, and that he knew the proneness and inclination of man's corrupt kind and nature to that most odious and abominable vice.

. . . "Beware that thou forget not the covenant of the Lord thy God, which he made with thee, and so make to thyself any carved image of them which the Lord

hath forbidden to be made, for the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, and a jealous God."

... This (4th chapter of Deuteronomy) is a notable chapter, and treateth almost altogether of this matter ; but because it is too long to write out the whole, I have noted you certain principal points out of it. First, how earnestly and oft he (God) calleth upon them to mark and to take heed, and that upon the peril of their souls, to the charge which he giveth them. Then how he forbiddeth by a solemn and long rehearsal of all things in heaven in earth and in the water, any image or likeness of any thing at all to be made. Thirdly, what penalty and horrible destruction he solemnly, with invocation of heaven and earth for record, denounceth and threateneth to them, their children and posterity, if they, contrary to this commandment, do make or worship any image or similitude, which he so strictly hath forbidden.

... In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the fifth chapter, we are forbidden once to keep company, or to eat and drink with such as be called brethren or Christians, that do worship images. In Galatians v. the worshipping of images is numbered amongst the works of the flesh ; and in 1 Cor. x. it is called the service of devils, and that such as use it shall be destroyed. And in the sixth chapter of the said Epistle, and Galatians v. is denounced that such image worshippers shall never come into the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven. And in sundry other places is threatened, that the wrath of God shall come upon all such. And therefore St. John, in his Epistle, exhorteth us as his dear children, to beware of images. And St. Paul warneth us to flee from the worshipping of them, if we be wise ; that is to say, if we care for health, and fear destruction, if we regard the kingdom

of God, and life everlasting, and dread the wrath of God and everlasting damnation. For it is not possible that we should be worshippers of images and the true servants of God also ; as St. Paul teacheth, in 2 Cor. vi. affirming expressly that there can be no more consent or agreement between the temple of God—which all true Christians be—and images, than between righteousness and unrighteousness, between light and darkness, between the faithful and the unfaithful, or between Christ and the devil.

. . . The good angel of God, as appeareth in the book of St. John's Revelation, refused to be kneeled unto, when that honour was offered him of John : " Beware," saith the angel, " that thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant." But the evil angel, Satan, desireth nothing so much as to be kneeled unto, and thereby at once both to rob God of his due honour, and to work the damnation of such as make him so low courtesy.

. . . Lactantius hath these words : God is above man, and is not placed beneath, but is to be sought in the highest region. Wherefore there is no doubt but that no religion is in that place wheresoever any image is.

. . . Origen in his book against Celsus saith : It is not only a mad and frantic part to worship images, but also once to dissemble or wink at it.

. . . The opinion of all the rabblement of the popish church, maintaining images, ought to be esteemed of small or no authority ; for that it is no marvel that they, which have from their childhood been brought up amongst images and idols, and have drunk in idolatry almost with their mother's milk, hold with images and idols, and speak and write for them.

. . . St. Augustine the best learned of all ancient doctors, in his forty-fourth Epistle to Maximus, saith,

Know thou, that none of the dead, nor any thing that is made of God, is worshipped as God of the Catholic Christians, of whom there is a church also in your town. Note, that by St. Augustine, such as worship the dead, or creatures, be not Catholic Christians.

. . . Note ye, that the Bishops of Rome being no ordinary magistrates appointed of God out of their diocese, but usurpers of princes' authority contrary to God's word, were the maintainers of images against God's word, and stirrers up of sedition and rebellion, and workers of continual treason against their sovereign Lords, contrary to God's law, and the ordinances of all human laws; being not only enemies to God, but also rebels and traitors against their princes. These be the first bringers in of images openly into churches. These be the maintainers of them in the churches; and these be the means, whereby they have maintained them; to wit, conspiracy, treason, and rebellion against God and their princes.

. . . Their rites and ceremonies, in honouring and worshipping of the images or saints, be all one with the rites which the Gentile idolaters used in honouring their idols. First, what meaneth it, that Christians, after the example of the Gentile idolaters, go on pilgrimage to visit images, where they have the like at home, but that they have a greater opinion of holiness and virtue in some images, than other some, like as the Gentile idolaters had.

. . . Those which give the honour due to the Creator to any creature, do service acceptable to no saints—who be the friends of God—but unto Satan, God's and man's mortal and sworn enemy.

. . . And furthermore, in that they say that they do not worship the images, as the Gentiles did their idols, but God and the saints whom the images do represent;

and therefore that their doings before images be not like the idolatry of the Gentiles before their idols ; St. Augustine, Lactantius, and Clemens, do prove evidently, that by this their answer they be all one with the Gentile idolaters. . . . And to increase this madness, wicked men, which have the keeping of such images, for their greater lucre and advantage, after the example of the Gentile idolaters, have reported and spread abroad, as well by lying tales as written fables, divers miracles of images. . . . Thus do our image-maintainers in earnest apply to their images all such miracles, as the Gentiles have feigned of their idols. . . . The scriptures have for a warning hereof fore-shewed that the kingdom of Antichrist shall be mighty in miracles and wonders to the strong illusion of all the reprobates. But in this they pass the folly and wickedness of the Gentiles, that they honour and worship the relics and bones of our saints ; which prove that they be mortal men and dead, and therefore no gods to be worshipped ; which the Gentiles would never confess of their gods, for very shame. But the relics we must kiss and offer unto, specially on Relicsunday.

. . . Of these things already rehearsed, it is evident that our image maintainers have not only made images, and set them up in temples, as did the Gentile idolaters their idols ; but also that they have had the same idolatrous opinions of the saints, to whom they have made images, which the Gentile idolaters had of their false gods, and have not only worshipped their images with the same rites, ceremonies, superstition, and all circumstances, as did the Gentile idolaters their idols, but in many points also have far exceeded them in all wickedness, foolishness and madness. And if this be not sufficient to prove them image worshippers, that is

to say, idolaters, lo, you shall hear their own open confession ; I mean not only the decrees of the second Nicene council under Irene, the Roman council under Gregory III. in which, as they teach that images are to be honoured and worshipped, as is before declared, so yet do they it warily and fearfully in comparison to the blasphemous, bold, blazing of manifest idolatry to be done to images set forth of late, even in these our days ; the light of God's truth so shining, that, above other their abominable doings and writings, a man would marvel most at their impudent, shameless, and most shameful blustering boldness ; who would not at the least have chosen them a time of more darkness as meeter to utter their horrible blasphemies in ;—but have now taken an harlot's face, not purposed to blush, in setting abroad the furniture of their spiritual whoredom. And here the plain blasphemy of the reverend father in God, James Naclantus, Bishop of Clugium, written in his exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and the first chapter, and put in print now of late at Venice, may stand instead of all ; whose words of image-worshipping be these in latin, as he did write them, not one syllable altered.

Ergo non solum fatendum est, fideles in ecclesia adorare coram imagine, ut nonnulli ad cautelam forte loquuntur ; sed et adorare imaginem, sine quo volueris scrupulo. Quin et eo illam venerantur cultu, quo et prototypon ejus. Propter quod, si illud habet adorare latria, et illa latria ; si dulia, vel hyperdulia, et illa pariter ejusmodi cultu adoranda est.

The sense whereof in English is this : Therefore it is not only to be confessed that the faithful in the church do worship before an image, as some peradventure do warily speak ; but also do worship the image itself, without any scruple or doubt at all. Yea, and

they worship the image with the same kind of worship, wherewith they worship the copy of the image, or the thing whereafter the image is made. Wherefore if the copy itself is to be worshipped with divine honour—as is God the Father, Christ, and the Holy Ghost—the image of them is also to be worshipped with divine honour. If the copy ought to be worshipped with inferior honour, or higher worship, the image also is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship.

. . . And thus you see, how from having of images privately, it came to public setting of them up in churches and temples, although without harm at the first, as was then of some wise and learned men judged ; and from simply having them there, it came at the last to worshipping of them ; first by the rude people—who specially, as the scripture teacheth, are in danger of superstition and idolatry—and afterwards by the Bishops, the learned, and by the whole clergy. So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom—an horrible and most dreadful thing to think—have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry ; of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man ; and that by the space of eight hundred years and more.

. . . He is the enemy of the true worshipping of God, that bringeth idols and images into the temple and church, the house of God, there openly to be worshipped, and to rob the jealous God of his honour, who will not give it to any other, nor his glory to carved images ; who is as much forsaken, and the bond of love between man and him as much broken by idolatry, which is spiritual fornication, as is the knot and bond of marriage broken by carnal fornication.

. . . Shall God's word, by God commanded to be

read unto all, and known of all, for danger of heresy, as they say, be shut up? and idols and images, notwithstanding they be forbidden by God, and notwithstanding the danger of idolatry by them, shall they yet be set up, suffered, and maintained in churches and temples? O worldly and fleshly wisdom! ever bent to maintain the inventions and traditions of men by carnal reason, and by the same to disannul or deface the holy ordinances, laws, and honour of the eternal God, who is to be honoured and praised for ever.—
Homily against the Peril of Idolatry.

(46.)— . . . What is remarkable and comfortable to all believing Protestants, we charge them (the Romanists) with flat idolatry in the adoration of the sacrament, of relics, of saints, of images. And, howsoever they excuse themselves in distinguishing their manner of adoration, yet, I say, to our endless comfort be it spoken, *they cannot charge us, in the doctrine of our church, no, not with the least suspicion of idolatry.*—*Sir H. Lynde's Via Tuta. See Burnet on the 39 Articles, edited by the Rev. J. R. Page, p. 250.*

(47.)— We Protestants worship God, and pray to him through the mediation of Jesus Christ. This the Romanists acknowledge to be right. The saints in heaven we love and honour as members of the same mystical body with ourselves. The holy angels we reverence as the ministers of the Divine will. But as for praying to either, there being no argument for it in reason, nor precept in scripture, nor indeed example in antiquity for at least three hundred years after scripture, it surely cannot be a thing necessary. Letting it

alone is undoubtedly safe : whether practising it be so, the Church of Rome would do well to consider. They tell us indeed, that they only beg the prayers of the saints in heaven, as we do those of good persons on earth. And were this true, (as I shall prove it is not) we desire our fellow Christians on earth to pray for us, because we know they hear our desires ; and surely it is reason enough not to ask those in heaven to do it, because we do not know they hear us, nor have the least cause to think they do. For scripture, which alone could tell us so, hath told us no such thing. But besides, if we can at all understand scripture, it hath expressly forbidden all applications to the inhabitants of the invisible world, excepting the Supreme Being. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God," says Moses, "and him only shalt thou serve," Matt. iv. 10. "There is one God, and one Mediator," says St. Paul, "between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. ii. 5. Accordingly we find, that the angel which appeared to St. John in the Revelation, forbids any religious honour to be paid him, even when present. "See thou do it not : I am thy fellow-servant ; worship God," Rev. xix. 10 ; xxii. 9. And when some among the Colossians had affected unjustifiable practices of this kind, St. Paul censures them as being in a very dangerous error. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen," 2 Col. ii. 18. Yet does the Church of Rome intrude so much further as to pay undue worship to beings far below angels ; not only to the saints in heaven, but to some who were so wicked on earth, that there is great reason to fear they are in hell, and to others that are mere fictions of their own imaginations, and never were at all. For

the sake of these, and through their merits, they desire, in their public and authorized prayers, God's mercy, sometimes quite omitting to mention the merits of Christ, and sometimes joining his and theirs together. Farther than this, they directly pray to them in the house of God, and in the same posture in which they pray to God ; and that not only to intercede with him for them, but, in so many words, that they themselves would bestow grace and mercy upon them, would forgive the guilt of their sins, deliver them from hell, and grant them a place in heaven. What pretence is there now in Christianity for such things as these ? And what doth this tend to, but making the ignorant, especially, think their favourite saint can do every thing for them right or wrong ? To him therefore they recommend themselves, not by a religious life, but by flattering addresses and costly presents ; on his intercession they often depend much more than our blessed Saviour's ; and being secure as they think, of the favour of these courtiers of heaven, pay little regard to the king of it. Thus is the intent of religion destroyed, and the heathen multitude of deities brought silently back into Christianity.

The adoration paid by the Papists to the Virgin Mary is very remarkable. We honour her memory as a person whom He that is mighty hath peculiarly magnified, and whom all generations shall call blessed. (Luke i. 48, 49.) But they address her in such terms as follow : Empress of Heaven ; Queen of Angels and Men ; through whom, after God, the whole earth liveth ; Mother of Mercy ; the Fountain of Grace and Salvation ; the only hope of sinners : who ever trusted in thee, and was confounded ! To thee I commit all my hope, and all my comfort : under thy defence is my refuge ; make haste to help me in all things which I

shall either do or think every moment of my life ; loose the bonds of the guilty, enlighten the eyes of the blind, free us from all sin, and drive away from us all evil, grant us to escape eternal damnation, and cause the glory of paradise to be bestowed on us. What authority, or what excuse is there now for such expressions as these ? And yet every one of them I have myself collected, partly out of their public offices, partly from others of their authorized and approved books of devotion. Formerly in their very Mass Book they went yet farther ; and begged her, by virtue of her parental authority, to command of her Son, what they wanted. But to this very day, in another office, they intimate the same thing, by exhorting her that she should shew herself to be his mother. And the better to make sure of her doing so, they apply to St. Joachim, who they say was her father, though indeed it is not certainly known at all, who her father was ; much less whether he was saint or sinner. However, they apply to St. Joachim, and tell him, that, as his daughter can possibly deny him nothing, it is in his power to do every thing he will for them. This, you see, is being very artful in making interest ; only it is more art than is necessary. For since we are both permitted and appointed to approach God through Christ directly, who, we are certain, both doth hear and will help us, we shall prejudice instead of benefitting our cause, by making underhand applications to other persons, who, perhaps, never come to know of our petitions, and, if they do, are displeased at them : or, if they were not, can be in comparison of little use to us.

Yet to judge by the practice of the Romish church, who would not think that the whole New Testament were filled with precepts for the worship of the saints,

especially the blessed Virgin ! Whereas, even in the Gospels, she is but seldom occasionally mentioned ; our Saviour seeming on purpose to take less notice of her, as if he foresaw what advantages taking more would give to the extravagance of after times. In the Acts she is just mentioned once. In the Epistles and Revelation not at all. Yet these are not half the monstrous things that the Romanists are guilty of about her. They have invented a fable of her body being taken up into heaven, and appointed a solemn festival in honour of it. They have instituted a form of devotion called the Rosary, in which ten addresses are made to her for one to God ; and successive popes have granted large indulgences and blessings to all that say it. Then their private writers about her have gone incredible lengths. One of their Cardinals, Bonaventure, by putting her name instead of God's, and some other necessary alterations, hath applied the whole book of Psalms to her. In the same manner he hath altered the Te Deum. " We praise thee, O Mary, we acknowledge thee to be the Lady ;" and so in the other hymns of the church. Nay, he hath made a creed for her, in imitation of St. Athanasius's. ' Whoever will be saved, it is necessary that he hold the true faith concerning Mary, which except a man keep whole and undefiled he shall perish everlastingly.' Now if their church do really disapprove these things, why do they never censure them ? Why is this very man canonized for a saint, whilst we are condemned as heretics ? For not content with thinking this kind of worship lawful, they pronounce accursed whoever shall think otherwise.

Another thing in which we differ from the Roman Catholics, is this—They make pictures of God the Father under the likeness of a venerable old man. They make images of Christ and of his saints, after their own

fancy. Before these images, and even that of his cross, they kneel down and prostrate themselves : to these they lift up their eyes, and in that posture pray. The least appearance of command, or even the allowance of such practices in Scripture they pretend not ; and yet against those who disallow them, they thunder out anathemas. Now as to pictures of the Father Almighty, whom no man either hath seen, or can see, (1 Tim. vi. 16.) all visible figures must represent him such as he is not, must lead the ignorant into low and mean ideas of him, and give those of better abilities, from a contempt of such representation, a contempt of the religion that uses them. Anciently the Heathens themselves had no images of God ; and a very learned Heathen observes, that if they had never had any, their worship would have been the purer ; for the inventors of these things, says he, lessened among men the reverence of the divine nature, and introduced errors concerning it. The Jews, though the Old Testament figuratively expresses, in words, the power and attributes of God by parts of the human form, were yet most strictly forbidden all sensible representations of him under any form. "Take good heed unto yourselves," says Moses, "for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake to you in Horeb ; lest ye corrupt yourselves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, and make the similitude of any figure ; for the Lord thy God is as a consuming fire, even a jealous God." (Deut. iv. 15, 21.) Accordingly we find, that when they had made a golden image, though it was expressly designed in honour of that God, who brought them out of Egypt, it was, notwithstanding punished as *idolatry*. And far from allowing to Christians, what was then forbidden the Jews, St. Paul, most severely condemns it in the very Heathens,

that "when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, but became vain in their imaginations, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man." (Rom. i. 21, 23.) Yet how near doth this approach to what the Church of Rome doth now, in making pictures of God the Father! Our blessed Saviour indeed, having taken on him human nature, is capable of being represented in a human form. But, as all representations must be imaginary ones, so they are useless ones too: the memorial of himself, which he hath appointed in the Sacrament, we may be assured is sufficient to all good purposes; and these other memorials have always produced absurd and wicked superstitions. As for the images of the saints, it is sufficient to say, that there being no pretence for worshipping the saints themselves, there is yet less pretence for worshipping these representations of them. But there the Church of Rome will say we wrong them: they do not worship images, but only Christ and his saints by these images. But indeed, it is they who wrong themselves then. For not a few of their own writers (Aquinas, &c.) frankly own they do worship images, and with the same degree of worship that they pay to the persons whose images they are. And for the cross, particularly in their public offices, they expressly declare themselves to adore it, and, in plain words, petition it in one of their hymns, "to give increase of grace to the righteous, and pardon to the guilty." This they say is a poetical licence; and truly, in so serious a thing as worship, no small one.

But farther, had they no regard to the image, but only to the persons represented, why is an image in one place looked upon to have so much more power and virtue, than an image of the same person in ano-

ther place ? Why hath that of our lady of Loretto, for instance, so much more honour done it, than that of our lady any where else ? We own the council of Trent does give a caution, that no divinity be ascribed to images, nor any trust put in them ; and the heathen gave the like caution often with respect to theirs : but this never hinders the Scriptures from condemning them as *idolaters*. And the reason is, that such cautions never are, or can be observed by the multitude. Place sensible objects before them to direct their worship to, and in those objects their worship will, terminate. This the primitive Christians saw too plainly in the Heathens, even to think of imitating them. Accordingly, neither images nor pictures were allowed in churches for near four hundred years. And when, after being more than once condemned, they came to be allowed, no honour was intended to be paid to them. On the contrary, when it began to be paid, which indeed was not long, it was severely censured, and particularly in the eighth century, by above three hundred bishops, assembled in council at Constantinople. But about thirty years after, the second council of Nice, (so ill did councils agree,) established it. Yet even this council held representations of God to be unlawful, and all the western countries, except Italy, under the pope's immediate direction, continued to condemn the worship of all representations, for some ages afterwards. But by degrees it first became general ; and then so grossly scandalous, that the Church of Rome, it seems, hath judged it the wisest way to leave the second commandment, which too plainly forbids these things, out of their smaller books of devotion, under the absurd pretence of its being only a part, I suppose an insignificant one, of the first, though since they have been charged with this, they have

thought fit in some of them, but not in all, to restore it again. And here let us quit the article of image-worship, with the Psalmist's remark upon it: "They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them. O Israel, trust thou in the Lord." Psalm cxv. 8, 9.

There still remains another object of Popish worship, the sacramental bread and wine. For they have made it an article of faith, that the substance of these is, by the words of consecration, entirely changed into the substance of the living body and blood of Christ, which change therefore they call Transubstantiation. Now were this really the body of Christ, it is allowed we have no command to worship it under this disguise, and therefore commit no sin in letting such worship alone. But if it be really not so, they own themselves to pay that honour to a bit of bread, which belongs only to the eternal Son of God. And surely one should think it a question easily decided, whether a small wafer, which is the bread they use on these occasions, be the body of a man, and whether wine in a cup be blood. Almost every one of our senses will tell us it is not; and though, in some hasty or distant appearances of things, our senses may be deceived, yet if, where there is all possible opportunity of examining the matter, we cannot be sure of what our own eyes, and our own feeling, our smelling and tasting all inform us of, then we can be sure of nothing. . . . Here therefore we fix our foot: if these things be to every man living evidently absurd and impossible, then let nobody ever regard the most specious pretences of proving such doctrines, or the authority of a church that maintains them. It is no hard matter for an artful man, a little practised in disputing, so to confound a plain man upon almost any subject, that

ther place? Why hath that of
for instance, so much more honour
of our lady any where else?

Trent does give a caution, that
to images, nor any trust put
gave the like caution after
this never hinders the
them as *idolaters*.

tions never are, or
Place sensible of
worship to, and
terminate. This

plainly in the
them. Accord-
allowed in c
when, after
came to

paid to
paid, w
sured.

very visible : the doctrine of the Trinity
three a mystery ; that is, the whole of the subject
star to be fully understood by us. But in transub-
stantiation there is no mystery at all. For the most
ident falsehoods are just as clearly understood to be
so as the most evident truths. In the Trinity there is
nothing we see to be false, only we do not see the
particular manner in which some things said concerning
it are true ; but in transubstantiation there are many
things we see to be false, and which can in no manner be
true. Let them show us any contradiction in the doc-
trine of the Trinity, and we will believe it no longer.
In the mean time, since we have shown contradiction
in transubstantiation, let *them* believe that no longer.

But they have Scripture to plead for it. Now if
this were a doctrine of Scripture, it would sooner

arguments,

, that his church

stantiation is true.

ch plainer argument, of

ed to judge, that transub-

oly be true, and therefore his

ie.

say, that transubstantiation hath no

than the Trinity hath. But surely the

very visible : the doctrine of the Trinity

a mystery ; that is, the whole of the subject

to be fully understood by us. But in transub-

stantiation there is no mystery at all. For the most

ident falsehoods are just as clearly understood to be

so as the most evident truths. In the Trinity there is

nothing we see to be false, only we do not see the

particular manner in which some things said concerning

it are true ; but in transubstantiation there are many

things we see to be false, and which can in no manner be

true. Let them show us any contradiction in the doc-

trine of the Trinity, and we will believe it no longer.

In the mean time, since we have shown contradiction

in transubstantiation, let *them* believe that no longer.

But they have Scripture to plead for it. Now if

this were a doctrine of Scripture, it would sooner

false, than Scripture could prove
 the Papists, by making
 an article of faith, have
 what which, *did it belong*
 to it. But God be
 on our side than rea-
 son said, when
 I say." But so
 verily, I am the
 vine, "I am the vine."

ways called a representa-
 tion of what is represented.

to be understood in the same

how do we think the apostles under-

stood as they were used to do in such cases?

We see that Scripture by no means favours

substantiation. It is indeed express against it:

For St. Paul more than once tells us, that what we eat
 in the sacrament is *bread*, and as for what we drink,
 when our Saviour says, "This is my blood which is
 shed for you;" if he had meant literally, he had spo-
 ken falsely; for his blood was not shed till afterwards,
 and could not be drunk then. Neither is it in a con-
 dition of being shed at present, and therefore cannot
 be drunk now. But too much hath been said of this
 monstrous doctrine, to which the indiscretion of well-
 meaning writers gave the first occasion pretty early,
 whilst they affected to heighten the figurative expres-
 sions of Scripture by still more figurative ones of their
 own: little thinking at the same time, that such an
 absurd meaning, as the Papists now plead for, could
 ever be ascribed to them; and plainly shewing by
 innumerable proofs, that it is unjustly ascribed to
 them. But as ignorance and superstition increased
 about eight hundred years after Christ, this ama-

he shall not well know how to answer, though he sees himself to be right, and the other wrong. This is an art which the priests of the Church of Rome are well versed in. Indeed, the chief part of their learning is to puzzle themselves first, and as many others as they can afterwards. But always observe this rule,—stick to common sense against the world; and whenever a man would persuade you of anything evidently contrary to that, never be moved by any tricks and fetches of sophistry, let him use ever so many. He will be for proving to you by round-about arguments, of which you are unqualified to judge, that his church is infallible, and therefore transubstantiation is true. Do you answer him by a much plainer argument, of which you are well qualified to judge, that transubstantiation cannot possibly be true, and therefore his church is not infallible.

. . . But they say, that transubstantiation hath no more difficulty than the Trinity hath. But surely the difference is very visible: the doctrine of the Trinity is indeed a mystery; that is, the whole of the subject cannot be fully understood by us. But in transubstantiation there is no mystery at all. For the most evident falsehoods are just as clearly understood to be so as the most evident truths. In the Trinity there is nothing we see to be false, only we do not see the particular manner in which some things said concerning it are true; but in transubstantiation there are many things we see to be false, and which can in no manner be true. Let them show us any contradiction in the doctrine of the Trinity, and we will believe it no longer. In the mean time, since we have shown contradiction in transubstantiation, let *them* believe *that* no longer.

But they have Scripture to plead for it. Now if this were a doctrine of Scripture, it would sooner

prove Scripture to be false, than Scripture could prove it to be true, and therefore the Papists, by making such a monstrous absurdity an article of faith, have loaded their religion with a weight which, *did it belong to Christianity*, were able to sink it. But God be thanked, Scripture is no more on their side than reason. We know indeed that our Saviour said, when he gave the Sacrament, "This is my body." But so at another time he said, "Verily, verily, I am the door of the sheep:" and at a third, "I am the vine." And so have all mankind always called a representation of any thing by the name of what is represented. Why then is he not to be understood in the same figure here? How do we think the apostles understood him, but as they were used to do in such cases?

. . . We see that Scripture by no means favours transubstantiation. It is indeed express against it: for St. Paul more than once tells us, that what we eat in the sacrament is *bread*, and as for what we drink, when our Saviour says, "This is my blood which is shed for you;" if he had meant literally, he had spoken falsely; for his blood was not shed till afterwards, and could not be drunk then. Neither is it in a condition of being shed at present, and therefore cannot be drunk now. But too much hath been said of this monstrous doctrine, to which the indiscretion of well-meaning writers gave the first occasion pretty early, whilst they affected to heighten the figurative expressions of Scripture by still more figurative ones of their own: little thinking at the same time, that such an absurd meaning, as the Papists now plead for, could ever be ascribed to them; and plainly shewing by innumerable proofs, that it is unjustly ascribed to them. But as ignorance and superstition increased about eight hundred years after Christ, this ama-

zing notion began to be distinctly and explicitly entertained and asserted, which some had the good sense to oppose : some the weakness to receive, as a mystery that promoted the reverence of the sacrament ; others the wickedness to support with zeal, as an artifice that increased the authority of the priests ; for what could he not do, who, as they blasphemously express it, could make God ? By degrees, then this doctrine prevailed, till, in the thirteenth century, it was established as an article of faith. And when once the speculative error of believing the consecrated bread and wine to be literally the body and blood of Christ, obtained, the practical one of worshipping them as such quickly followed. For though a decent respect was always paid to the sacrament, yet a direct adoration to the elements was never paid, till the dark and superstitious ages above mentioned, introduced so senseless an *idolatry* to the infinite scandal of religion. May God, who mercifully winked at the times of heathen ignorance, overlook this less excusable folly of Christians, and “ forgive them, for they know not what they do.” But let us all remember, that our case will be much worse than theirs, if, after the light hath so clearly shone upon us, we return to darkness again : if, as the apostle expresses it, “ we change the truth of God into a lie, and worship the creature instead of the Creator, who is blessed for evermore.” Amen.—*Archbishop Secker's Five Sermons against Popery, arranged by Bishop Porteus, p. 25—39. Published by Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.*

(48.)— . . They are for ever damned by the Trent Creed, who do not hold and practice the invocation of the saints deceased. For this is one of the articles of

that creed, without the belief whereof they tell us none can be saved : that isall are damned who pray unto God alone through Christ the mediator, as the Scripture directs, and the Catholic Church of the first and best ages hath practised.

. . . It is added in the Creed, that not only the saints themselves, but also their reliques are to be worshipped. A strange definition of the Trent fathers, especially if we consider the time when it was made ; a time when the best and wisest men in the Roman communion sadly complained of the vile cheat put upon the poor ignorant people, by showing them, I know not what reliques of saints, and drawing them to the worship of them, only for gain's sake, and to pick their pockets.

. . . The next article of the Trent Creed is this : ' I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, and the ever virgin mother of God, and other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.' A doughty article indeed worthy to be ushered in with a ' I most firmly assert !' But is this really an article of the Catholic Christian faith, without the belief whereof there is no salvation ? What then is become again of the Catholic Church of the first three centuries and downward ? For it is certain, that the church of those days never allowed the use of images in her oratories or conventicles, much less the adoration and worship of them.

. . . I am persuaded that no man of judgment and integrity that hath been conversant in the Holy Scriptures, and in the writings of the more ancient doctors of the church, will be able to read those acts of the pretended synod of Nice, without indignation and abhorrence of it, when he observes upon what ridiculous fables, gross misinterpretations of Scripture, falsi-

fications, and impertinent allegations of the ancient fathers, the bishops of that convention built their decree concerning image-worship. Notwithstanding all this, the bishops at Trent chose to follow that wretched synod, and have decreed, and that as an article of faith, most firmly to be asserted, that the images of Christ, and the saints, are to be retained, yea, and worshipped too.

. . . Cassander confesseth, that there are men in the Church of Rome, otherwise no ill men, who trust in their patron saints *more* than in Christ their Redeemer. His words are these :—‘ There are some, and those no bad men neither, who have made choice of certain saints for their patrons and guardians, and put more trust in their merits and intercession than in the merits of Christ.’

It is pretended by some Romanists, especially of late, that their prayers to saints amount to no more than a praying or desiring them to pray for us, as we desire the prayers of one another here on earth, this is manifestly false; for besides what hath been before observed, that they pray to saints deceased, and in a state and place vastly distant from them, wherein they cannot possibly hear their prayers, unless by revelation, or in the glass of the Trinity, which are groundless imaginations; I say besides this, divers of their greatest doctors ingenuously confess, yea, and boldly profess, that they pray to the saints, as they are appointed by God to the conduit pipes between him and us, conduit pipes, or instruments of conveying his grace to us. So our Alexander of Hailes, ‘ Seeing the divine grace descends to us by means of the saints, it is but fit that our ascent to God be through their mediation.’ So their learned Archbishop of Florence: ‘ It is the law of the Deity to raise the things below,

to those that are above, by those in the middle; but as to the gifts of grace, the saints stand in the middle betwixt God, and such as are travelling towards him. Hence the divine benefits descend upon us by the mediation of angels and holy souls.' They say also, that the saints do procure for us, and convey to us God's blessings by the merit of their intercession, and that this is the ground of their praying to them. So again Alexander of Hailes, as above: 'The saints are invoked by us by reason of our want of merit, that where our deserts fail, those of others may help us out.' So the great master of the sentences, Peter Lombard: 'We pray them to intercede for us, that is, that their merits may succour us.' And indeed most of their prayers to the saints are so expressed, that they cannot without violence be interpreted to any other sense.

But most extravagant is the invocation and worship of the blessed Virgin used and practised in the Church of Rome. I will not urge here the hymn in Cassander's time, sung in their churches: 'Beseech thy mother, command thy son, O happy parent, who makest expiation for our wickedness by thy authority as a mother, command the Redeemer.' Nor the Psalter of our lady, mentioned also by Cassander, as that which was in use in his time, in which, through the whole book of Psalms, wheresoever the name of the Lord occurred, it was changed into the name of our lady; though I know not whether those horrid blasphemies were ever censured and condemned by any public act of the Roman church.

But I do affirm, that there are still such addresses and forms of prayer to the blessed Virgin either enjoined or allowed by authority to be used in the Church of Rome, as no man who hath a due concern

for the honour of his Redeemer, can read or hear without abhorrence and detestation. Such is that in the office of blessed Mary, where they thus speak to her : ‘ Hail, queen, the mother of mercy, our life, delight, and hope, hail ! we shelter ourselves under thy protection, despise not our supplications in the times of our necessity, but deliver us from all dangers, thou ever-glorious virgin.’ This is surely more than ‘ Pray for us,’ for they pray unto her as their life and hope, and fly to her as their refuge and protection, beseeching her to deliver them always from all dangers. But chiefly it is to be remarked, that she is here called the queen and mother of mercy. Would you know the meaning of this ? Berchorius will tell you : ‘ The truth is, whereas the kingdom of God consists in these two virtues, justice and mercy, God bestowed on Mary, the queen of paradise, the half part of his kingdom, that is, the mercy ; and for this cause it is, she is called the mother of mercy.’ The same exposition you may find in Biel ; and Cassander also acknowledgeth this to be the sense of that title given to the blessed virgin.

In the Litany of our lady, published in English here among us, she is called ‘ queen of angels, patriarchs and apostles, source of the fountain of grace, refuge of sinners, comfort of the afflicted, and advocate of all Christians.’ Now we have no instance of such attributes given to the blessed Virgin, either in the Holy Scriptures, or in the writings of the ancient fathers ; and indeed they are too big for any mere creature. For here the government of heaven, and all the holy angels therein, is attributed to her, which belongs only to our Lord Christ. And what do they mean by that title which they give her of source of the fountain of grace ? I cannot imagine any other meaning of it,

than this, that the Virgin Mary receiving first the emanation or efflux of grace, from God the fountain of grace, by and through her all grace is carried and conveyed down to all the faithful. And so indeed Bernardinus explains the matter in these words: 'No creature has obtained any grace or virtue from God, but by the dispensation of this pious mother.' They that under this notion address themselves to the blessed Virgin, surely do much more than desire her to pray for them, as we desire the prayers of one another.

What do they mean when they say, she is the refuge of sinners? From what hath been said before concerning the kingdom of mercy, supposed to be committed to the blessed Virgin, and concerning the title of queen of mercy given her, we may conclude the sense to be this, that when sinners are troubled in their consciences, and terrified with the sense of their sins, and of the judgment of God denounced against them, they may and ought to have recourse to her, as the queen of mercy, as their asylum and sanctuary, to shelter and protect them from the divine vengeance. This, a credible author, (Chemnitz,) assures us, hath been represented in several Roman Catholic temples, in which Christ hath been painted with an angry, menacing countenance, casting his darts against sinners, and the blessed Virgin interposing herself as mediatrix, and repelling his darts. But Christ our Lord directs poor guilty sinners, whose consciences are oppressed with the burthen of their sins, to a far better refuge, yea, the only refuge they are to fly to, even to himself; "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matt. xi. 28.

And who can read without the greatest horror, such a prayer to the blessed Virgin as this that follows:—

‘ O my Lady, holy Mary, I recommend myself into thy blessed trust, and singular custody, and into the bosom of thy mercy, this night, and evermore, and in the hour of my death, as also my soul and my body : And I yield unto thee all my hope and consolation, all my distress and miseries, my life and the end thereof; that by thy most holy intercession, and by thy merits, all my works may be directed according to thine and thy Son’s will. Amen.’ What fuller expressions can we use to declare our absolute affiance, trust, and dependence on the eternal Son of God himself, than they here use in this recommendation to the Virgin? And who observes not that the will of the blessed Virgin is expressly joined with the will of her Son, as the rule of our actions, and that so, as that her will is set in the first place? A smatch of their old blasphemous impiety, in advancing the mother above the Son, and giving her a commanding power over him. Yet this recommendation to the blessed Virgin, is to be seen in a manual of prayers and litanies printed at Antwerp, no longer ago than 1671, and that by superior permission, and appointed to be used in the evening prayer for Friday. . . . Upon the whole matter, I cannot but think those silly women of Arabia, who once a year offered a cake in honour to the blessed Virgin as queen of heaven, to be as excusable at least as her devotees in the Church of Rome. And yet they in their days were thought worthy of a place in the catalogue of heretics. Sure I am, most of the arguments Epiphanius useth against the Colliridians may serve every whit as well against the papists.

To pass by the worship of images, allowed and practised in the Church of Rome, of which I have said enough before : come we now to the principal part of Christian worship, the holy sacrament of the Eu-

charist. How lamentably hath the Church of Rome vitiated the primitive institution of that most sacred rite ! She hath taken from the laity the blessed cup, contrary to our blessed Saviour's express command, as expounded by the practice of the Apostles, and of the universal Church of Christ, for the first ten centuries. . . . All the learned advocates of the Roman Church with all their sophistry, have not been able to defend her in this matter, from manifest sacrilege, and a violation of the very essentials of the sacrament, as to the laity administered, nor can they prove it so administered, to be a perfect sacrament. He that would see this in a short compass fully proved, and all the weak evasions of the Romanists obviated, may consult our learned Bishop Davenant. (In his Determination, of the twenty-first question, that the Roman Church is apostatical, p. 104.)

. . . But the worst ceremony of all is, the elevation of the Host to be adored by the people, as very Christ himself under the appearance of bread, whole Christ, God and man, while they neglect the old, the lifting up their hearts to heaven, where whole Christ, indeed is. A practice this is, which nothing can excuse from the *grossest idolatry*, but their gross stupidity, or rather insatiation, in thinking that a piece of bread can by any means whatsoever, or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour. . . . I might pass from the holy Eucharist, to the other sacrament of Baptism, and expose the many strange ceremonies used in the Church of Rome in the consecration of the font, and in the very administration of that sacrament. I might also take notice of the prayers used by the order of the Roman church in the consecration or blessing of certain inanimate things, for the producing supernatural effects, such as curing diseases,

driving away devils, &c. without any warrant from scripture, or promise of God that such effects shall follow.—*Bishop Bull's Corruptions of the Church of Rome, published by the Christian Knowledge Society.*

(49.). . . In the scriptures we are taught that there is only *one* God, and in the Nicene creed we profess it. But the Church of Rome by her adoration of angels and saints, and prayers to them for spiritual and temporal blessings, becomes a worshipper of *many* gods. The scriptures teach us that there is *one* Mediator between God and man, and only *one* name under heaven by which men must be saved; but in the Church of Rome every saint is a Mediator, and every Mediator a Saviour. By the scriptures we are taught that Christ offered himself *once* on the cross for the sins of mankind. The Church of Rome professes in the mass to offer up Christ *every day* as a propitiatory sacrifice to God. In the gospel we are taught to honour the Son even as we honour the Father. But in the Church of Rome greater honour is paid to the Virgin Mary than to the Son or to the Father. The Church of England believes, that Christ in his *divine nature* is omnipresent, and that he is nowhere *bodily* present, but in heaven at the right hand of God. The Church of Rome teaches that Christ is *bodily* present in the consecrated bread of the Eucharist, and in every particle of bread, that is eaten at the Lord's Supper. Nothing more strongly shows the fundamental difference of the Church of Rome from the Church of England than the *doctrine*, that the bread and wine are changed by consecration into the body and blood of Christ; and the *worship* of Christ, under the *visible forms* of bread and wine; the belief of which the

Church of Rome declares to be necessary to every man's salvation ; but which the Church of England pronounces to be idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. (Declaration subjoined to the Communion Service.)

You object, my Lord, to the imputation of *Idolatry*, as applied by the Protestant prelates of the Irish Church to the Church of Rome. The charge of idolatry was so applied by our Reformers of the sixteenth century, who were born and bred papists, and knew by their own experience and knowledge what Popery was. It is so applied in our Liturgy and Homilies, and has been so applied by the best informed and most learned¹ Protestants from their time to the present. It may be sufficient to quote the testimony of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. 'We know *idolatry* is a damnable sin ; and we know, that the Roman Church, with all the artifices she could use, never can justify herself, or acquit the common practice (image-worship) of idolatry.' It is the legitimate language of Parliament, and has been the language of your lordship's own solemn declaration, as often as you have taken your seat in either House of Parliament,—in terms expressive of the most unequivocal *belief* that 'the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass as now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.'

... Your lordship objects to that part of the petition of the Protestant prelates of Ireland, which appeared to you to be couched in injurious, uncharitable, and unchristian language towards the Roman Catholic

¹ Bishop Jewel, Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Bilson, Bishop Andrews, Bishop White, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Davenant, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Downam.

Church of Ireland. 'The words *usurpation*, *idolatry*, and *blind superstition*,' you observe 'are not terms of conciliation, nor were they fit language for a bench of right reverend prelates.' The language is justified by the example of the many great authorities before mentioned, from Bishop Jewell down to Archbishop Usher, who have proved the Church of Rome to be usurping, idolatrous, and superstitious. The words are not terms of conciliation; but they are the language of truth, of history, and (as before mentioned) of parliamentary authority. What other term indeed than *usurpation* can be given to the assumption of universal dominion over the Church of Christ, which the Pope and the Church of Rome have employed to the degradation of sovereigns, the interdict of kingdoms, and the massacre of provinces? What other terms can with truth be applied to the bowing down in prayer before the images of saints, and to the adoration of Christ under the visible forms of bread and wine, than those, which are employed by our church and parliament, and constitutionally adopted by your lordship?

Your lordship laments the great errors of the Church of Rome; and you scruple not to deprecate the spirit of some of her doctrines. But experience has abundantly shewn, that those errors are not to be reformed, nor her doctrines mitigated, by conciliation and concession. To call *idolatry*, *superstition*, and *apostasy* by any other terms than by their own appropriate appellations, is not to conciliate the church, that is guilty of such corruptions, but to confirm her members in their errors, and to mislead uninformed Protestants. The prophet's denunciation is true in respect of religion above all other subjects: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil, that put

darkness for light, and light for darkness.”—*Bishop Burgess’s Letter to Lord Melbourne, on the Idolatry and Apostasy of the Church of Rome, 1835, p. 5—12.*

(50.)— Against this use, or rather horrible abuse, of images, to what purpose should we heap up any testimonies of Holy Scripture, if the words of the second commandment, uttered by God’s own mouth with thundering and lightning upon Mount Sinai, may not be heard? *Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them.* Which thunderclap from heaven the guides of the Romish Church discerning to threaten sore that fearful idolatry which daily they commit, thought fit in wisdom first to conceal the knowledge of this from the people, by excluding those words out of the Decalogue that went abroad for common use, under pretence, forsooth, of including it in the first commandment; and then afterwards to put this conceit into men’s heads, that this first commandment was so far from condemning the veneration of images, that it commanded the same, and condemned the contrary neglect thereof. And, therefore, Laurence Vaux, in his Catechism, unto this question, ‘Who breaketh the first commandment of God by unreverence of God?’ frameth this answer, ‘They that do not give due reverence to God and his saints, or to their relics and IMAGES.’ And Jacobus de Graffis, in his explication of the same commandment, specifieth the ‘due reverence’ here required more particularly, namely, ‘that we should reverence every image with the same worship that we do him whose image it is;

that is to say, that we impart *Latria*, or divine worship, to the image of God, or of Christ, or to the sign of the cross also, inasmuch as it bringeth the passion of our Lord unto our mind, and that we use the adoration of *Hyperdulia* at the image of the holy Virgin, but of *Dulia* at the images of other saints.' And can there be found, think you, among men a more desperate impudency than this, that not only the practice of this wretched idolatry should be maintained against the express commandment of Almighty God, but also that he himself should be made the author and commander of it, even in that very place where he doth so severely forbid it, and *reveal his wrath from heaven against the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, which withhold the truth in unrighteousness* ? The miserable shifts and silly evasions, whereby they labour to obscure the light of this truth, have been detected by others to the full, and touched also in some part by myself in another place, where I have shewed out of Deuteron. iv. 15, 16, and Rom. i. 23, that the adoring of the very true God himself in or by an image cometh within the compass of that idolatry which the word of God condemneth. And to this truth do the fathers of the ancient church give plentiful testimony, in what 'great account' soever our challenger would have us think that the 'use of images' was with them.—*Abp. Usher's Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge*, p. 433. Cambridge, 1835.

(51.)—... 'They that defended the law,' saith Theodoret, 'induced them also to worship the angels, saying that the law was given by them. And this vice continued in Phrygia and Pisidia for a long time, for which cause also the Synod assembled in Laodicea,

the chief city of Phrygia, forbade them by a law to pray unto angels. And even to this day among them and their borderers there are oratories of St. Michael to be seen. This, therefore, did they counsel to be done, using humility, and saying, that the God of all was invisible, and inaccessible, and incomprehensible ; and that it was fit men should get God's favour by the means of angels. And this is it which the Apostle saith, *in humility and worshipping of angels.*' Thus far Theodoret, whom Cardinal Baronius discerning to come somewhat close unto him, and to touch the idolatry of the popish crew a little to the quick, leaveth the poor shifts wherewith his companions labour to obscure the light of this testimony, and telleth us plainly, that 'Theodoret, by his leave, did not well understand the meaning of Paul's words ;' and that those oratories of St. Michael were erected 'anciently by Catholics,' and not by those 'heretics' which were condemned in the Council of Laodicea, as he mistook the matter. As if any wise man would be persuaded upon his bare word, that the memory of things done in Asia so long since, should be more fresh in Rome at this day than in the time of Theodoret, who lived twelve hundred years ago.

Yet must I needs confess, that he sheweth a little more modesty herein than Ballarmine his fellow-cardinal doth, who would make us believe that the place in the nineteenth of the Revelation, where the angel saith to St. John, that would have worshipped him, *See thou do it not : I am thy fellow-servant ; worship God,* maketh for them ; and demandeth very soberly, 'Why they should be reprehended who do the same thing that John did ?' and 'whether the Calvinists knew better than John whether angels were to be adored or no ;' and as for invocation of them, he

telleth us that St. Jacob plainly prayed unto an angel in the forty-eighth of Genesis, when in blessing the sons of Joseph he said, *The angel which delivered me from all evil bless those children.* Whom for answer we remit to St. Cyril, in the first chapter of the third book of his Thesaurus, and entreat him to tell us how near of kin he is here to those heretics of whom St. Cyril there speaketh. His words be these: 'That he doth not mean,' in that place, Genesis xlviii. 16, 'an angel, as the HERETICS understand it, but the Son of God, is manifest by this, that when he had said, *The angel*, he presently addeth, *who delivered me from all evils;*' which St. Cyril presupposeth no good Christian will ascribe to any but to God alone.

But to come more near yet unto that which is idolatry most properly. An idol, we must understand, in the exact propriety of the term, doth signify any image: but according to the ecclesiastical use of the word it noteth such an image as is set up for religious adoration. And in this latter sense we charge the adherents of the Church of Rome with *gross idolatry*; because that, contrary to God's express commandment, they are found to be worshippers of images. Neither will it avail them here to say, that the idolatry forbidden in the Scripture is that only which was used by Jews and Pagans. The Apostle, indeed, in this place dehorting Christians from idolatry, propoundeth the fall of the Jews in this kind before their eyes: *Neither be ye idolaters*, saith he, *as some of them were.* And so doth he also add concerning another sin, in the verse following; *Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed.* As well, then, might one plead that Jewish or heathenish fornication were here only reprehended, as Jewish or heathenish idolatry. But as the

one is a foul sin, whether it be committed by Jew, Pagan, or Christian ; so if such as profess the name of Christ shall practise that which the word of God condemneth in Jews and Pagans for idolatry, their profession is so far from diminishing, that it augmenteth rather, the heinousness of the crime. *The idols of the heathen are silver and gold, the work of mens hands*, saith the Psalmist : and so the idols (of Christians, in all likelihood) mentioned in the Revelation, are said to be *of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood ; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk*. The description of these idols, we see, agreeth in all points with popish images : where is any difference ?

The heathen, say they, held the images themselves to be gods, which is far from our thought. Admit some of the simpler sort of the heathen did so ; what shall we say of the Jewish idolaters, of whom the Apostle here speaketh, who erected the golden calf in the wilderness ? Can we think that they were all so senseless as to imagine that the calf, which they knew was not at all *in rerum natura*, and had no being at that time when they came out of Egypt, should yet be that *God which brought them out of the land of Egypt* ? And for the heathen, did the Romans and Grecians, when they dedicated in several places an hundred images, for example, to the honour of Jupiter, the king of all their gods, think that thereby they had made an hundred Jupiters ? or, when their blocks were so old that they had need to have new placed in their stead, did they think by this change of their images that they made change also of their gods ? Without question they must so have thought, if they did take the very images themselves to be their gods ; and yet the prophet bids us consider diligently, and

we shall find that the heathen nations *did not change their gods*, Jer. ii. 10, 11. Nay, what do we meet with more usually in the writings of the Fathers, than these answers of the heathens for themselves? ‘ We worship the gods by the images.’ ‘ We fear not them, but those to whose image they are made, and to whose names they are consecrated.’ ‘ I do not worship that stone, nor that image which is without sense.’ ‘ I neither worship the image nor a spirit in it; but by the bodily portraiture, I do behold the sign of that thing which I ought to worship.’

But admit they did not account the image itself to be God, will the papist further say, yet were those images set up to represent either things that *had no being*, or devils, or false gods, and in that respect were idols; whereas we erect images only to the honour of the true God, and of his servants the saints and angels. To this I might oppose that answer of the heathen to the Christians: ‘ We do not worship evil spirits; such as you call angels, those do we also worship; the powers of the great God, and the ministers of the great God;’ and put them in mind of St. Augustine’s reply: ‘ I would you did worship them; you should easily learn of them not to worship them.’ But I will grant unto them that many of the idolatrous Jews’ and heathens’ images were such as they say they were; yet I deny that all of them were such, and confidently do avouch, that idolatry is committed by yielding adoration to an image of the true God himself. For proof whereof (omitting the idols of Micah and Jeroboam, which were erected to the memory of Jehovah the God of Israel, as also the Athenian’s superstitious worship of the *unknown God*, Acts xvii. 23, if, as the common use of idolaters was, they added an image to their altar,) I will content myself with

two places of Scripture, the one whereof concerneth the Jews, the other the heathen. That which toucheth the heathen is in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where the Apostle having said that God had shewed unto them that which might be known of him, and that *the invisible things of him, that is, his eternal power and Godhead*, was manifested unto them by the creation of the world and the contemplation of the creatures; he addeth presently, that God was sorely displeased with them, and therefore gave them up unto vile affections, because *they changed the glory of that incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible men, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things*. Whereby it is evident, that the idolatry condemned in the wisest of the heathen was the adoring of the invisible God, whom they acknowledged to be the Creator of all things, in visible images, fashioned to the similitude of men and beasts.

The other place of Scripture is the fourth of Deuteronomy, where Moses useth this speech unto the children of Israel. *The Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice*, verse 12. And what doth he infer upon this? *Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves*, saith he in the 15th verse, *for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire: lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, the likeness of any thing that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth*. Where we may observe first, that God in the delivery of the law did

purposely use a voice only, because that such a creature as that was not to be expressed by visible lineaments, as if that voice should have said unto the painter, as Echo is feigned to do in the poet :

“ Vane, quid affectas faciem mihi ponere, pictor?
Si mihi vis similem pingere, pingere sonum.”

Secondly, that when he uttered the words of the second commandment in Mount Sinai, and forbade the making the likeness of any thing *that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth*, he did at that time forbear to shew himself in any visible shape, either of man or woman, either of beast in the earth, fowl in the air, or fish in the waters beneath the earth, to the end it might be the better made known, that it was his pleasure not to be adored at all in any such forms, and that the worshipping of images, not only as they have reference to the creatures whom they do immediately represent, or to false gods, but also as they have relation to himself, the true God, who was then speaking to them in the mount, did come within the compass of the idolatry which was condemned in that commandment.

In vain, therefore, do the Romanists go about to persuade us that their images be no idols, and as vainly also do they spend time in curiously distinguishing the several degrees of worship; the highest point whereof, which they call Latreia, and acknowledge to be due only unto God, they would be loth we should think they did communicate to any of their images. But here we are to understand, first of all, that idolatry may be committed by giving not the highest only, but also the lowest degree of religious adoration unto images; and therefore, in the words of the command-

ment, the very *bowing down unto them*, which is one of the meanest degrees of worship, is expressly forbidden. *Secondly*, that it is the received doctrine of popish divines, that the image should be honoured with the same worship wherewith that thing is worshipped whose image it is; and therefore what adoration is due to Christ and the Trinity, the same by this ground they are to give unto their images. *Thirdly*, that in the Roman Pontifical, published by the authority of Clement the Eighth, (to omit other testimonies in this kind), it is concluded, that the cross of the Pope's legate shall have the right hand, upon this very reason, *quia debetur ei latría*, 'because the worship proper to God is due to it.' Now, whether they commit idolatry, who communicate unto a senseless thing that worship, which they themselves confess to be due unto God alone, let all the world judge.

They were best, therefore, from henceforth confess themselves to be idolaters, and stand to it that every kind of idolatry is not unlawful. Their Jesuit, Gregorius de Valentia, will tell them for their comfort, that it is no absurdity to think that St. Peter when he deterreth the faithful by name *ab illicitis idolorum cultibus* (*αθεμίτους εἰδωλολατρειας* St. Peter calleth them, that is abominable idolatries), doth insinuate thereby that some worship of images is lawful. John Monceye, the Frenchman, in his *Aaron Purgatus*, dedicated to the late Pope Paul the Fifth, and in his twenty questions propounded to Visorius, stretcheth yet a strain higher. For howsoever he cannot away with the name of idols and idolatry, yet he liketh the thing itself so well, that he undertaketh to clear Aaron from committing any error in setting up the golden calf, and laboureth to purge Laban, and Micah, and Jeroboam too, from the imputation of idolatry, having

found indeed that nothing had been done by them in this kind which is not agreeable to the practice of the Roman Church at this day.

And lest the poor people, whom they have so miserably abused, should find how far they have been misled, we see that the masters of that Church do, in the service books and catechisms which come unto the hands of the vulgar, generally leave out the words of the second commandment that make against the adoration of images, fearing lest by the light thereof the mystery of their iniquity should be discovered. They pretend, indeed, that this commandment is not excluded by them, but included only in the first ; whereas in truth they do but craftily conceal it from the people's eyes, because they would not have them to be ruled by it. Nay, Vasquez the Jesuit doth boldly acknowledge, that it plainly appeareth by comparing the words of this commandment with the place which hath been alleged out of the fourth of Deuteronomy, that the Scripture did not only forbid the worshipping of an image for God, but also the adoration of the true God himself in an image. He confesseth further, that he and his fellow-Catholics do otherwise. What saith he then to the commandment, think you ? Because it will not be obeyed it must be repealed, and not admitted to have any place among the moral precepts of God. It was, saith he, a positive and ceremonial law, and therefore ought to cease in the time of the Gospel. And as if it had not been enough for him to match the Scribes and Pharisees in impiety, who *made the commandment of God of none effect, that they might keep their own tradition*, that he might fulfil the measure of his fathers, and shew himself to be a true child of her who beareth the name of being *the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth*, he is yet more mad, and

sticketh not to maintain, that not only a painted image, but any other thing of the world, whether it be without life and reason, or whether it be a reasonable creature, may (in the nature of the thing, and if the matter be discreetly handled) be adored with God, as his image, yea, and counteth it no absurdity at all, that a very wisp of straw should be thus worshipped.

But let us *turn yet again* and we shall see greater abominations than these. We heard how this blessed sacrament, which is here propounded by the apostle as a bond to unite Christians together in one body, hath been made the apple of strife, and the occasion of most bitter breaches in the Church : we may now observe again, that the same Holy Sacrament, which by the same Apostle is here brought in as a principal inducement to make men *flee from idolatry* is by our adversaries made the object of the *grossest idolatry* that ever hath been practised by any. For their constant doctrine is, that in worshipping the Sacrament they should give unto it *latricæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur*, as the Council of Trent hath determined, ‘ that kind of service which is due to the true God ;’ determining their worship in that very thing which the priest doth hold betwixt his hands. Their practice also runs accordingly ; for an instance whereof we need go no further than to Sanders’s book of the Lord’s Supper, before which he hath prefixed an epistle dedicatory, superscribed in this manner. ‘ To the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, all honour, praise, and thanks be given for ever :’ adding further in the process of that blockish epistle, ‘ Howsoever it be with other men, I adore thee, my God and Lord really present under the forms of bread, and wine, after consecration duly made ; beseeching thee of pardon for my sins, &c.’

Now, if the conceit which these men have concerning the Sacrament should prove to be false, (as indeed we know it to be most absurd and monstrous), their own Jesuit Coster doth freely confess, that they should be in such an 'error and idolatry, *qualis in orbe terrarum, nunquam vel visus vel auditus fuit*, as never was seen or heard of in this world.' 'For the error of them is more tolerable,' saith he, 'who worship for God a statue of gold or silver, or an image of any other matter, as the Gentiles adored their gods: or a red cloth lifted up upon a spear, as it is reported of the Lappians; or living creatures as did sometime the Egyptians; than of those that worship a piece of bread.' We, therefore, who are verily persuaded that the Papists do thus, must of force, if we follow their Jesuit's direction, judge them to be *the most intolerable idolaters that ever were*.

Nay, according to their own principles, how is it possible that any of themselves should certainly know that the host which they worship, should be any other thing but bread? Seeing the change doth wholly depend upon 'consecration duly made,' as Sanders speaketh, and that dependeth upon the intention of the priest, which no man but himself can have notice of. Bellarmine, disputing against Ambrosius Catharinus, one of his own brethren, that a man hath no certain knowledge of his own justification, can take advantage of this, and allege for himself, that one cannot be certain by the certainty of faith that he doth receive a true sacrament, forasmuch as the sacrament cannot be made without the intention of the minister, and none can see another man's intention.' Apply this now to the matter we have in hand, and see into what intricate labyrinths these men have brought themselves. Admit the priest's intention stood right at the time of con-

secration, yet if he that baptized him failed in his intention when he administered that sacrament, he remaineth still unbaptized, and so becometh incapable of priesthood; and consequently whatsoever he consecrateth is but bread still. Yea, admit he were rightly baptized too, if either the bishop that conferred upon him the sacrament of orders, (for so they hold it to be), or those that baptized or ordained that bishop, missed their right intention, neither will the one prove bishop, nor the other priest; and so with what intention soever either the one or the other doth consecrate, there remaineth but bread still. Neither doth the inconvenience stay here, but ascendeth upward to all their predecessors, in any one of whom if there fall out to be a nullity of priesthood, for want of intention either in the baptizer or in the ordainer, all the generation following, according to their principles, go without their priesthood too, and so deliver but bread to the people instead of the body of Christ. The Papists themselves, therefore, if they stand unto their own grounds, must needs confess that they are in no better case here than the Samaritans were in, of whom our Saviour saith, *Ye worship ye know not what; but we know that what they worship (be the condition or intention of their priest what it will be) is bread indeed; which while they take to be their God, we must still account them guilty of spiritual fornication, and such fornication as is not so much as named amongst the Gentiles.*

These, then being the idolaters with whom we have to deal, let us learn *first*, how dangerous a thing it is to communicate with them in their false worship; for if we will be partakers of Babylon's sins, we must look to receive of her plagues. *Secondly*, we are to be admonished, that it is not sufficient that in our own persons we refrain worshipping of idols, but it is further

required that we restrain as much as in us lieth, the practice thereof in others ; lest by suffering God to be dishonoured in so high a manner, when we may by our calling hinder it, we make ourselves partakers of other men's sins. Eli the high priest was a good man, and gave excellent counsel unto his lewd sons ; yet we know what judgment fell upon him, *because his sons made themselves vile, and he frowned not upon them*, that is, restrained them not, which God doth interpret to be a kind of idolatry in *honouring of his sons above him*. The Church of Pergamus did for her own part hold fast Christ's name, and denied not his faith ; yet had the Lord something against her, *because she had there them that held the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Isarel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication*. So we see what special notice our Saviour taketh of the works, and charity, and service, and faith, and patience of the Church of Thyatira, and yet for all this he addeth, *Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols*.

In the second of Judges, God telleth the children of Israel, what mischief should come unto them by tolerating the Canaanitish idolaters in their land : *They shall be thorns in your sides, saith he, and their gods shall be a snare unto you*. Which words contain in them the intimation of a double danger, the one respecting the soul, the other the body. That which concerneth the soul is, that their idols should be *a snare unto them* : for God well knew that man's nature is as prone to spiritual fornication as it is to corporal. As, therefore, for the preventing of the one he would not

have a common harlot tolerated in Israel, *lest the land should fall to whoredom, and become full of wickedness*; so for the keeping out of the other he would have provocations taken away, and all occasions whereby a man might be tempted to commit so vile a sin. The bodily danger that followeth upon the toleration of idolaters is, that *they should be in their sides*, that is, as in another place it is more fully expressed, *they should be pricks in their eyes, and thorns in their sides, and should vex them in the land wherein they dwelled*. Now, in both these respects it is certain that the toleration of the idolaters with whom we have to do, is far more perilous than of any other. In regard of the spiritual danger, wherewith simple souls are more like to be ensnared, because this kind of idolatry is not brought in with an open shew of impiety, as that of the Pagans, but is *a mystery of iniquity*, a wickedness covered with the veil of piety; and the harlot, which maketh the inhabitants of the earth drunk with the wine of this fornication, is both gilded herself, and presenteth also her abominations unto her followers in *a cup of gold*. If we look to outward peril, we are like to find these men not thorns in our sides to vex us, but daggers in our hearts to destroy us. Not that I take all of them to be of this furious disposition, (mistake me not; I know a number myself of a far different temper;) but because there are never wanting among them some turbulent humours, so inflamed with the spirit of fornication that they run mad with it, and are transported so far that no tolerable terms can content them, until they have attained to the utmost pitch of their unbridled desires: for compassing whereof there is no treachery, nor rebellion, nor murder, nor desperate cause whatsoever, that, without all remorse of conscience, they dare not adventure upon.

. . . . If matters now become unto this pass, that such as are addicted to the Pope will account the oath of allegiance to have less force to bind them than a rope of straw, judge ye whether that be not true which hath been said, that in respect not of spiritual infection only, but of outward danger also to our state, any idolaters may be more safely permitted than Papists. Which I do not speak to exasperate you against their persons, or to stir you up to make new laws for shedding of their blood. Their blindness I do much pity, and my heart's desire and prayer to God for them is that they might be saved. Only this I must say, that, things standing as they do, I cannot preach peace unto them. For as Jehu said to Joram, *What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?* so must I say unto them, *What peace can there be, so long as you suffer yourselves to be led by the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, who by her sorceries hath deceived all nations, and made them drunk with the wine of her fornication?* Let her put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts; let her repent of her murders, and her sorceries, and her idolatries: or rather, because she is past all hope, let those that are seduced by her cease to communicate with her in these abominable iniquities, and we shall be all ready to meet them, and rejoice with the angels in heaven for their conversion. In the meantime, they who sit at the helm, and have the charge of our Church and commonwealth committed to them, must provide by all good means, that God be not dishonoured by their open idolatries, nor our king and state endangered by their secret treacheries. Good laws there are already enacted to this purpose, which, if they were duly put in execution, we should have less need to

think of making new. But it is not my part to press this point. I will therefore conclude as I did begin : *I speak as to wise men : judge ye what I say.*—*Archbishop Usher's Sermon preached before the House of Commons. See Usher's Answer to a Jesuit, p. 672—688. Cambridge, 1835.*

(52.)—... The business of transubstantiation is not a controversy of Scripture against Scripture, or of reason against reason, but of downright impudence against the plain meaning of scripture, and all the sense and reason of mankind.

It is a most self-evident falsehood ; and there is no doctrine or proposition in the world that is of itself more evidently true, than transubstantiation is evidently false.

... There are a company of men in the world so abandoned and given up by God to the efficacy of delusion, as in good earnest to believe this gross and palpable error, and to impose the belief of it upon the Christian world, under no less penalties than a temporal death and eternal damnation. And therefore, to undeceive, if possible, these deluded souls, it will be necessary to examine the pretended grounds of so false a doctrine, and to lay open the monstrous absurdity of it.

... If there be no necessity of understanding our Saviour's words in the sense of transubstantiation, I am sure there is a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise. Whether we consider the like expressions in scripture ? as where our Saviour says he is *the Door and the true Vine*, (which the Church of Rome would mightily have triumphed in, had it been said, *this is my true Body*.) And so likewise where the Church is

said to be *Christ's Body* ; and the *Rock* which followed the Israelites to be Christ, 1 Cor. x. 4. They drank of that *Rock* which followed them, and that *Rock* was Christ : All which, and innumerable more like expressions in scripture, every man understands in a figurative, and not in a strictly literal and absurd sense.

... The doctrine of the *corporeal presence of Christ* was first started upon occasion of the dispute about the *worship of images*, in opposition whereto the Synod of Constantinople, about the year 750, did argue thus : that our Lord having left us no other image of himself but the sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord. In answer to this argument, the second Council of Nice, in the year 787, did declare, that the sacrament, after consecration, is *not the image and antitype* of Christ's body and blood, but is *properly* his body and blood. So that the corporeal presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament, was first brought in to support the *stupid worship of images* : and indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper occasion, nor have been applied to a fitter purpose.

... We assign a punctual and very likely time of the first rise of this doctrine, about the beginning of the ninth age ; though it did not take first root, nor was fully settled and established till towards the end of the eleventh. And this was the most likely time of all other, from the beginning of Christianity, for so gross an error to appear ; it being, by the confession and consent of their own historians, the most dark and dismal time that ever happened to the Christian Church, both for ignorance, and superstition, and vice. It came in together with *idolatry*, and was made use of to support it ; a fit prop and companion

for it. And indeed what tares might not the enemy have sown in so dark and long a night; when so considerable a part of the Christian world was lulled asleep in profound ignorance and superstition?

... I have shown likewise that there was considerable opposition made to this error at its first coming in. The general ignorance and gross superstition of that age rendered the generality of people more quiet and secure, and disposed them to receive any thing that came under a pretence of mystery in religion, and of a greater reverence and devotion to the sacrament, and that seemed any way to countenance the worship of *images*, for which at that time they were zealously concerned. But notwithstanding the security and passive temper of the people, the men most eminent for piety and learning in that time made great resistance against it.

... The last pretended ground of this doctrine is, to magnify the power of the priest in being able to work so great a miracle. And this with great pride and pomp is often urged by them as a transcendent instance of the Divine wisdom, to find out so admirable a way to raise the power and reverence of the priest, that he should be able every day, and as often as he pleases, by repeating a few words, to work so miraculous a change, and (as they love most absurdly and blasphemously to speak) to make God himself.

... To speak the plain truth, the Christian religion was never so horribly exposed to the scorn of atheists and infidels, as it hath been by this most absurd and senseless doctrine. But thus it was foretold that the man of sin should come with power and signs, and lying miracles, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, with all the legerdemain and juggling tricks of falsehood and imposture; amongst which this of

Transubstantiation, which they call a *miracle*, and we a *cheat*, is one of the chief: and in all probability those common juggling words of *hocus-pocus*, are nothing else but a corruption of *Hoc est corpus*, by way of ridiculous imitation of the priests of the Church of Rome in their trick of transubstantiation. Into such contempt by this foolish doctrine, and pretended miracle of theirs, have they brought the most sacred and venerable mystery of our religion.

. . . Had the ancient Christians owned any such doctrine, we should have heard it from the adversaries of our religion in every page of their writings, and they would have desired no greater advantage against the Christians, than to have been able to hit them in the teeth with their feasting upon the natural flesh and blood of their Lord, and their God, and their best friend. What endless triumphs would they have made upon this subject? And with what confidence would they have set the cruelty used by Christians in their Sacrament, against their God Saturn's eating his own children, and all the cruel and bloody rites of their idolatry? But that no such thing was then objected by the heathens to the Christians, is to a wise man instead of a thousand demonstrations that no such doctrine was then believed. It is scandalous upon account of the *cruel and bloody consequences* of this doctrine; so contrary to the plain laws of Christianity, and to one great end and design of this sacrament, which is to unite Christians in the most perfect love and charity to one another: whereas this doctrine hath been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody tragedies that ever were acted in the world. For this hath been in the Church of Rome the great *burning article*: and as absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murdered for the

denial of it than perhaps for all the other articles of their religion.

. . . It is scandalous also upon account of the danger of *idolatry*, which they are certainly guilty of if this doctrine be not true, and such a change as they pretend be not made in the sacrament; for if it be not, then they worship a creature instead of the creator, God blessed for ever. But such a change I have shown to be impossible: or if it could be, yet they can never be certain that it is, and consequently are always in danger of idolatry: and that they can never be certain that such a change is made, is evident; because, according to the express determination of the Council of Trent, that depends upon the mind and *intention of the priest*, which cannot certainly be known but by revelation, which is not pretended in this case: and if they be mistaken in this change, through the knavery or crossness of the priest, who will not *make God*, but when he thinks fit, they must not think to excuse themselves from idolatry because they intended to worship God and not a creature; for so the Persians might be excused from idolatry in worshipping the sun, because they intend to worship God and not a creature; and so, indeed we may excuse all the idolatry that ever was in the world, which is nothing else but a mistake of the deity, and upon that mistake a worshipping of something as God which is not God.

. . . Upon the whole matter I shall only say this, that some other points between us and the Church of Rome are managed by some kind of wit and subtlety, but this of transubstantiation is carried out by mere dint of impudence and facing down of mankind.

And of this the more discerning persons of that church are of late grown so sensible, that they would

now be glad to be rid of this odious and ridiculous doctrine. But the Council of Trent hath rivetted it so fast into their religion, and made it so necessary and essential a point of their belief, that they cannot now part with it if they would ; it is like a millstone hung about the neck of popery, it will sink it at the last.

And though some of their greatest wits, as Cardinal Perron, and of late, Monsieur Arnauld, have undertaken the defence of it in great volumes ; yet it is an absurdity of that monstrous and massy weight, that no human authority or wit is able to support it. It will make the very pillars of St. Peter's crack, and requires more volumes to make it good than would fill the Vatican.

And now I would apply myself to the poor deluded people of that church, if they were either permitted by their priests, or durst venture without their leave, to look into their religion, and to examine the doctrines of it. *Consider and show yourselves men.* Do not suffer yourselves any longer to be led blindfold, and by an implicit faith in your priests, into the belief of nonsense and contradiction. Think it enough and too much to let them rook you out of your money, for pretended pardons and counterfeit relics ; but let not the authority of any priest or church, persuade you out of your senses. Credulity is certainly a fault as well as infidelity : and he who said, " Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed ; " hath no where said, Blessed are they that have seen, and yet have not believed ; much less, Blessed are they that believe directly contrary to what they see.

. . . This doctrine of theirs being first plainly proved by us to be destitute of all divine warrant and authority, our objections against it from the manifold contradic-

tions of it to reason and sense are so many demonstrations of the falsehood of it. Against all which they have nothing to put in the opposite scale but the infallibility of their Church, for which there is even less colour of proof from scripture than for transubstantiation itself. But so fond are they of their own innovations and errors, that rather than the dictates of their Church, how groundless and absurd soever, should be called in question : rather than not have their will of us, in imposing upon us what they please, they will overthrow any article of the Christian faith, and shake the very foundations of our common religion : a clear evidence that the Church of Rome is not the true mether, since she can be so well contented that Christianity should be destroyed, rather than the point in question should be decided against her.—*Archbishop Tillotson's Discourse against Transubstantiation—Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.*

(53.)—What heathenism was to the Old Testament dispensation, as Bishop Horsley truly observes, the same precisely is popish idolatry to the evangelical. It is a scheme of the devil to draw men from the Omnipotent Head Jesus Christ, to the creatures, St. Peter and the saints. This is popery.—*Christian Guardian, Dec. 1825. p. 471.*

(54.)—The idolaters of antiquity and the papists of modern times are much upon a footing. The Church of Rome is at this day a corrupt church, a church corrupted with idolatry ; with idolatry very much the same in kind and in degree with the worst that ever

prevailed among the Egyptians or the Canaanites.—*Bishop Horsley.*

(55.)—This term (Devils) thus used, proves that the worship of saints and angels, as mediators in the anti-christian system is as much *idolatry*, and centres as much in the worship of evil spirits as the Pagan worship did, and that it was introduced, and is maintained by the seduction of the ‘devil and his angels,’ even as Heathen idolatry was.—*Rev. T. Scott’s Commentary*, 1 Tim. iv. 1.

(56.)—We cannot serve God and Mammon, nor worship the true God and idols, nor depend upon Christ Jesus, and superstitions or self-righteous confidences. No coalition ought so much as to be attempted in these cases.—*Ibid.* Deut. xii.

(57.)—. . . History informs us that the popes were opposed by many of the churches in their wicked attempts to introduce the worship of images. In the eight century, the council of Frankfort which was attended by three hundred bishops of various nations, condemned equally the second council of Nice, and the worship of images. The British churches followed the same line of conduct. Had this resistance not been overcome by the popes, the visible church within the western empire never would have been transformed into an image of the beast: but at length the popes overpowered the efforts of the friends of truth. Idolatry was universally introduced, and thenceforth the church, as a whole, was marked by all the features of the

character of the first beast, secularity, blasphemy, idolatry, and persecution, and became therefore an image of the beast. . . . The authority of the image was universal, so that whosoever would not worship the image was killed.—*Cuninghame on the Apocalypse*, p. 185. 2nd Ed.

(58.)—The charge of idolatry which is made by protestants against the church of Rome, may be easily substantiated, not only from the practice of that church in the dark ages, but from its authorised and avowed standards in the present day. I refer to the liturgy of that church, edited by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, and printed by Keating, Brown, and Keating, in 1812, and which is presumptuously entitled, ‘Liturgy, or a Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, with other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, for the use of all Christians in the United Kingdom;’ by which it is plainly insinuated, that all the protestants of the United Kingdom who reject this Liturgy, are not Christians. In this Liturgy the old idolatry of the Church of Rome, in adoring the consecrated wafer and cup in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, is still retained, as appears by the following words, taken from the Directory of the Mass: ‘After pronouncing the words of consecration, the priest kneeling adores and elevates the sacred host,’ (or consecrated bread) ‘and the bell at the altar is rung to give notice to the congregation.’ In like manner it is said, after the consecration of the cup, ‘Here also kneeling he adores and elevates the chalice’ or cup.

The following words are taken from the liturgy in honour of the blessed Virgin Mary, commonly called

the Litany of Loretto. We should scarcely believe it possible, that such matter should be published in this enlightened country, in the nineteenth century, as a form of Christian worship ; But as it has been printed, it is fit to make it generally known, in order that all men may see that the Romish Church obstinately cleaves to its abominations.

‘ We fly to thy patronage, O Holy Mother of God ! despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever-glorious and blessed Virgin !’

‘ Pray for us, O Holy Mother of God !’

... There are without doubt many excellent persons who adhere to the communion of the Church of Rome, from the prejudices of education ; but it becomes all such persons to examine the scriptures for themselves, and not to put confidence in their priests ; for if the bible be the word of God, idolatry is a sin of a most heinous nature, and in those who have the scriptures in their hands it is inexcusable.—*Ibid.* p. 189.

(59.)—As to the awful question, who will and who will not be saved ? it happily belongs not to us to answer. To his own master every man will stand or fall. That those who attend the mass, and pay divine worship to a piece of bread, are guilty of idolatry, there can be no doubt ; and that idolaters (continuing such) cannot be saved, is asserted by St. Paul. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.—*Hobson’s Dialogues between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic.* Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, p. 39.

(60.)—It is a first principle of Christianity, that there is one living and true God; and that *He alone* is the proper object of religious worship. The language of Jehovah, the God of Israel, to his people is, “I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt worship *only me*.” Divine worship, therefore, offered to any other is direct rebellion against him. It is marked by the prophet Jeremiah, as one of the grossest instances of the idolatry of the children of Israel, in imitation of their heathen neighbours, that they worshipped an idol whom they called the queen of heaven,¹ (Jer. vii. 18; xliv. 17—19.) Now this is actually a title which is given by the Church of Rome to one of her principal idols, namely, the Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There can be no doubt that the mother of our Lord, according to the flesh was blessed among women. From all that is recorded of her, however, it is evident that her blessedness arose not only or chiefly from the mere circumstance of her being the mother of Jesus, but from her being a partaker of that grace which is extended to all Christians alike. Mary makes no great figure in the evangelical history; and when she is brought into view, it seems intended rather to repress than to cherish any idea of her being preferred before other followers of Christ. Indeed, when she is brought into view, one is apt to wonder that so little account is made of her; but the Spirit of God, no doubt foreseeing that she would be made an object of idolatrous worship, so ordered matters, that nothing should be done to her, or said of her that should give

¹ It is remarkable that the Papists have adopted this title in the worship of the Virgin Mary, styling her ‘The Queen of heaven;’ as if they were ambitious of resembling the Jews in their idolatry.—*Scott’s Commentary*, Jerem. vii. 18.

the smallest countenance to such impiety. In the Church of Rome, however, she is as really an object of worship, as Diana was in Ephesus, or Venus in Paphos, or any other god or goddess in any heathen nation in the world.

. . . Common sense tells us that one, to whom prayer is addressed by millions of needy creatures, with a belief that such prayers are heard and will be answered, must be present every where, must know all things, and must have almighty power to do all that his worshippers call on him for. Such power and knowledge belong to the living and true God, and to him alone. To ascribe such perfection to a creature, and to worship a creature, is that very idolatry, and opposition to the authority of the true God, of which the Almighty declares his abhorrence throughout the Bible, for which he sent his ancient church into captivity in Babylon; and for which he has not only sent the Church of Rome into a worse captivity, but has made her the antitype of that very Babylon itself, and the oppressor of the true church of God.

Archbishop Usher gives several quarto pages of extracts from a popish version of the Psalms, in the original Latin with a translation. Here the Virgin Mary is the Alpha and the Omega. The most sublime ascriptions of praise to the Creator and Preserver of all things, are addressed to Mary, under the title of 'our Lady.' The last psalm is made to begin with 'Praise our Lady in her saints; praise her in her virtues and miracles; and it concludes thus,—*Omnis spiritus laudet Dominam nostram*;—let every spirit, (or every thing that has breath) praise our Lady.'—*Usher's Answer, &c.* p. 493.

. . . It (popery) is the very dregs of the filth of the idolatry of ancient nations,—so much the more loath-

some, that it professes to be of divine origin, and to be the religion of Him who was holy, harmless, undefiled; and who came to save his people from their sins; and to create them anew after his own image, in righteousness and true holiness.

... No man can obtain the pardon of sin but through the merits or righteousness of Christ; but the deluded votary of the Virgin Mary is taught by his church to ask this blessing for the sake of a mere creature. The purity, the humility, and the abundant charity of Mary, are supposed to be so meritorious as to make up for the want of these qualities in her devout worshippers. This is the great comprehensive sin of popery. It is trusting in a creature instead of trusting in the living God, and this, according to the word of God, brings down a curse instead of a blessing. In short, popish devotion consists, according to their approved liturgies, in little else than calling upon the Virgin Mary and other saints; that is, invoking and praying to mere creatures, which is downright idolatry.

... I do the church of Rome no injustice, when I charge her with both idolatry and absurdity. For what can be more absurd, than fellow-creatures, and fellow-servants worshipping one another? What can be more impious as well as absurd than praying to fellow-creatures, and requesting them to intercede and mediate with God for us, when we are assured by the word of God, that there is "*one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus?*" What can be more impious than to call on the name of a mere creature to save us, when we are assured that besides Jesus Christ, there is no other name by which we can be saved? The Church of Rome is guilty of all this impiety, by teaching her deluded adherents to worship and call upon mere creatures.

It was false humility that led men first to think of approaching to God, through the medium of mere creatures. They professed to believe him too great, and themselves too unworthy to admit of direct intercourse. This would have been true if he had not of his infinite mercy, provided and revealed to us a medium of intercourse, and declared that his throne of mercy was accessible to any sinner of the human race who should come to him in the name of Christ. Having this revealed to us in the Scriptures, it is both our privilege and duty to come to him, in obedience to his invitation. He knows best what is suitable to his own glory, and to our circumstances; and as it is his glory to show mercy to the chief of sinners, they cannot honour him more than by coming to him as sinners, submitting to his righteousness, and accepting his overtures of mercy.

It is not humility, but pride, that prevents sinners from coming to God in the way which he has appointed. True humility would lead them to him in his revealed way; but pride will come only in its own way. Affecting to think themselves so very unworthy, and to believe God too great to regard them, papists have devised a way of their own, by which alone they will come to Him, that is, through the medium of creatures, whom they call saints. For this they have not the shadow of a warrant from the word of God; but being a way of their own devising, they adhere to it most pertinaciously; rather than not come to God in this way, they will not come at all; and as he never promised to accept any who came in this way, they can have no ground to hope that they will be accepted.

. . . Having undertaken to exhibit the true character of popery from the writings of papists themselves, it is necessary that I give pretty large extracts from

such writings. Some of these extracts are, indeed, disgusting for their impurity, and shocking for their impiety; but this I cannot help. To get acquainted with any thing, people must see it as it is. I know that many of my readers were quite ignorant of the true character of popery. I have undertaken to show it to them. I have, I trust, been in some degree successful, so far as I have gone. There are many Protestants that did not believe popery to be so bad as it is. They had a general idea that it was, during the dark ages, a system of cruelty, superstition, and idolatry; but they did not believe it to be so in the present day. Now it is my object to convince them that it is what it always has been. In establishing this point, considered abstractedly, I have the concurrence of popish writers themselves. They maintain that their religion is infallible and unchangeable. It cannot therefore be improved. There are many Protestants who charitably and liberally maintain that popery is not so bad as it was; but papists themselves spurn the compliment; and it argues a great degree of simplicity and good nature in Protestants, to persist in representing the Church of Rome as better than she wishes to be represented.

Notwithstanding all the evidence which is before the world, papists maintain broadly that their church never was idolatrous, which is a piece of as barefaced effrontery as to maintain that she never was guilty of persecution. They believe things contrary to the evidence of their own senses; and they expect us to do the same. They believe, for instance, that what they see to be a round piece of bread in the form of a wafer, is the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; and as such they worship it with divine honour; yet they say this is not idolatry, for the

priest has changed the wafer into God, though they see, and feel, and taste it to be a wafer still. This is not merely an error of the dark ages. It is taught as plainly in their modern catechisms, and believed as firmly at this day, as it was in the tenth century, when St. Dunstan preached it, and when Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, confirmed it by a miracle. Now, as papists give up their senses when they believe this, we must give up our senses when we believe them not to be idolaters. . . . I confess it would be extremely convenient for the cause of popery, if Protestants would be persuaded to make such a surrender ;—if every one would give up his reason, and his senses, and his conscience, to the direction of holy church, popery would soon appear among us in all *its glory*, that is, the solemn gloom of midnight darkness.

. . . To worship the true God under a false character is as really idolatry as to worship a false God. Of this the Church of Rome is notoriously guilty ; and this is not merely a human error grafted upon a divine religion, as some of their fooleries are supposed to be. It is a radical and fundamental error, which declares popery to be quite a different, and an opposite religion ;—to be, in short, that Antichrist that should come into the world.

. . . Let such of my readers as are alarmed for the growth of popery, attend to the root of the evil. It lies in the opposition of the carnal mind to the holy and humbling doctrine of Christ crucified. It is highly probable that if popery shall regain the ascendancy among us, and become the fashionable religion, the worldly part of the community will fall into it ; because the fundamental principles of popery, and mere nominal Christianity are the same.

. . . When the priests had made up their minds to

deceive the people, it was necessary that they should have recourse to fraud. It was not possible to reduce men and women altogether to the rank of brute beasts, though it was determined to rule them as such. The thinking and reasoning faculty was not quite extinct in the darkest ages. The priests could not inscribe on the wall behind the altar, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath," and then lay down upon the altar an image, or crucifix, to be worshipped. They could not insert the same words in any of their catechisms for the instruction of the people, and then exhort them to come and pay their devotions before an image of the Virgin Mary. In short, it was quite necessary that they should give up the worship of images, or conceal the divine command which forbids it. They chose to do the latter; and thus by suppressing a part of the divine law, they took upon themselves the condemnation of all those who, through ignorance, should be guilty of breaking it.

The priests, however, have not yet been entirely shamed out of this piece of fraud and imposition; for the second commandment is still omitted in such of their catechisms as are used in Ireland, and other unenlightened parts of Europe.

[The writer proceeds to give the high authorities which sanction image worship in the Church of Rome; and appeals to every reader, whether they do not, though there were nothing else against her, clearly convict that church of the grossest idolatry.]

... Papists cannot use a word in defence of their image worship, which was not used by the heathens before them. The heathen declared that the worship of their images was merely relative; and that it had respect to the being whom the image represented.

the
e of
t the
ad: i

ments
lies
steous-
gen-
g that
oligion
s have
call a
od, or
od and
onders.
ie *Pro-*

s letters
Roman
Relics
ords:—
ther the
merely
Are the
hat Dr.
he says
f Chris-
intaining
i images
he same
retained

For instance, they worshipped, in one place, Jupiter Capitolinus ; in another, Jupiter Olympius ; and they understood these to be merely different representations of the same god, not that the image itself was the god. They never could imagine that the sculptor made the god who made himself. This absurdity was left for the darker ages of counterfeit Christianity.

... The words *bowing* and *kissing* are the very terms used in scripture to denote divine worship : and the giving of which to any creature or image is declared to be idolatry. The strong language of Job (ch. xxxi. 26—28.) is decisive on this point.

... I shall conclude this number with the prayer used in the consecration of images, as it is found in the *Rituale Romanum*, authorised by Pope Urban VIII. ‘ Grant, O God, that whosoever before this image, shall diligently and humbly, upon his knees, worship and honour thy only begotten Son, or the blessed Virgin (according as the image is that is consecrating) or this glorious apostle, or martyr, or confessor, or virgin, that he may obtain by his or her merits, and intercession, grace in this present life, and eternal glory hereafter.’ ‘ Now,’ says Mr. Cuninghame, from whom I quote, ‘ if this be not gross idolatry, let the Church of Rome show wherein the worship of Jupiter and Apollo was idolatry.’

... Throughout the Old Testament history we find that God never forgot, and never ceased to remind the people of the sin of Jeroboam, wherewith he made Israel to sin ; and can we suppose that he overlooks the gross idolatries of the Church of Rome ? He does not send prophets to reprove them as he did to Jeroboam ; but he has given the complete volume of his word, which declares his abhorrence of idolatry, and that it shall not go unpunished. Neither does he,

in such a visible and sensible manner, connect the punishment with the sin, as he did in the case of Israel; but the punishment is not on that account the less certain; and it will be so much the more dreadful that it has been long delayed.

Deceit and falsehood are necessary accompaniments of image worship. The system is founded on lies, and supported by all deceivableness of unrighteousness. This has impressed a character upon the general body, which appears in almost every thing that they say and write on the subject of their religion and worship. Nay, some of their great casuists have declared a lie to be no sin, or only what they call a venial one, if it be to promote the glory of God, or one's own advantage. This system of falsehood and deceit appears in nothing more than in the lying wonders, which they relate concerning their images.—*The Protestant* : by Mr. M'Gavin. Vol. I.

(61.)—Dr. Philpotts, (Bp. of Exeter) in his letters to Charles Butler, Esq., on his Book of the Roman Catholic Church, concludes his third letter on Relics—Images—and the Cross, in the following words:—“And now, Sir, permit me to ask you, whether the doctrine of your Church respecting Images be merely what the works cited by you state it to be? Are the devotions, which we have been examining, what Dr. Milner means by ‘the *decent respect*,’ which, he says ‘Roman Catholics shew to the memorials of Christianity?’ Will he any longer persist in maintaining that ‘the end for which pious pictures and images are made and retained in your Church, is the same for which pictures and images are made and retained

by mankind in general—to put us in mind of the persons and things they represent?’ and that, ‘the relative veneration to which they are entitled,’ is no other than ‘the honour which Protestants themselves pay to the Bible, the name of Jesus, and even to the king’s throne?’

If, indeed, your doctrine were only this, could it have so often led its followers to the practice of direct idolatry? Or could the rulers of your Church have hesitated one instant to forbid all images, when the use of them was so little necessary, and the abuse so common and so tremendous? If it were only this, could cardinals, and popes, and saints, have so grossly misconceived, or so impiously perverted it? If it were only this, could the assembled piety and wisdom of the universal Church—above all, could that Holy Spirit, whom the Lord of life and love sent into the world to bless, to comfort, and to support his children—could he, guiding by his secret influence the decisions of a general council, condemn the impugners of such a doctrine to eternal torments? Could he, for so light an error, have shut us out from all hopes of mercy, have denied us all share in our Redeemer’s merits, made us outcasts from his love, and aliens from his inheritance? Is it thus his blessed promise is fulfilled, that “even the bruised reed he will not break, and the smoking flax he will not quench?” Has that Holy Spirit told us, that “we shall not make to ourselves any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing in heaven, in earth, or under the earth; that we shall not bow down to them, nor worship them;” and does the same Spirit cut us off for ever, if yet we scruple to respect and venerate them? Is the exact measure of observance due to images, by the will of God, so very nice, so very delicately

poised, and yet is mistake on either side big with danger to our soul's salvation?

Will you dare to answer these questions in the affirmative? If you will not, you must acknowledge, that the representation of your Church's doctrine, made by your modern apologists, is, in this instance, false and deceitful."

(62.)— . . Archbishop Wake, my Lord, would have been among the last to be seduced into any approval of the corruptions of Rome. He was a man, eminent indeed for the truly Christian benevolence which directed his life, his actions, and his thoughts; kind towards the persons of all from whom he differed; a lover and a cultivator of peace, but of that genuine peace, which never can be purchased by a surrender of the truth. He was early and long engaged in controversy with the papists: and of all the great divines, who stood forward in defence of the Church of England in that protracted and memorable contest, he, after Stillingfleet, was at once the most profoundly skilled in the learning, the most acute, solid, and judicious, in the argument of his cause. His gentle spirit led him to be moderate; but to convince you how he really thought and wrote of the Church of Rome, I will beg leave to add one or two quotations from his works in return for yours.

The charge of *idolatry* is repeatedly enforced by him; and that not incidentally, and by the way, but directly and argumentatively. The title of one of his chapters is as follows: 'that the Church of Rome thus worshipping of images, is truly and properly guilty of Idolatry.' (See Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England. Art. IV. § 3.)

Of the Invocation of Saints, after shewing largely that it is 'repugnant to God's word, contrary to antiquity, unreasonable, senseless, and unprofitable : '— 'but I insist,' says he, 'too long on these reflections. I add only, to close all, that this Invocation of Saints is as impious, as it is unprofitable ; for first, to take this practice in the most moderate sense that may be, &c.

Of the Adoration of the host, he says, that "the Church of England, consequently to her principles of the bread and wine remaining in their natural substances, professes that she thinks it to be *Idolatry, and to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.*

Of the sacrifice of the mass, that it "both makes up the chiefest part of the popish worship, and is justly esteemed one of the greatest and most dangerous errors that offend us."—*Dr. Philpotts' Letter to Earl Grey, in Appendix to Letters to C. Butler, Esq.*

(63.)—Calvin in his will says:—"First of all I give thanks to God that, taking compassion on me, (whom he had created and placed in this world,) not only did he deliver me out of the deep darkness of *idolatry* in which I was immersed," &c. Mr. Scott, in his continuation of Milner's Church History, Vol. iii. p. 475, remarks upon this;—"We see in what terms all these great and enlightened men speak of that *idolatry*, in which they themselves had been involved under the papacy."

(64.)—The true church is Christ's bride and spouse, she is betrothed unto him in righteousness, in loving-kindness, and in tender mercy; and at any time by

idolatry to apostatize from him is spiritual whoredom, which shall not pass without deserved punishment. Learn hence, how hateful idolatry is to God, and how highly it provokes God's wrath, even as the whoredom of a woman who plays the common harlot provokes the jealousy of her husband. Verily, never was husband more jealous of the chastity of his suspected wife, than God is jealous in point of worship.

. . . The Spirit of God seems to intimate that idolatry is like unto wine ; a sensual sort of worship, and therefore alluring ; making persons drunk, therefore intoxicating. Wine is sweet, but proves deceitful ; idolatry is pleasing to man's corrupt nature, but brings wrath and judgment upon the sinner.—*Burkitt on the New Testament*, Rev. xvii. 1, 2.

(65.)— . . Behold the blood-thirstiness of the Roman church, and her insatiableness therein even unto drunkenness. Observe with what wonder and admiration St. John was filled when he saw this woman drunk with blood, *I wondered with great admiration* ; intimating that so astonishing is the cruelty of that church, that it justly causes wonder and admiration to all that are not of her cruel and bloody disposition. I wonder that God should suffer so much of his dear servant's blood to be shed by her, and at her insatiable cruelty in shedding it. Observe how the Spirit of God was pleased to open this mystery, which indeed is the only vision of this nature expounded throughout the whole book. He begins first with a description of the beast, affirming that *he was and is not, and yet is* ; as if he had said, ' The Roman empire was once pagan, now is not pagan, but Christian ; and yet is as idolatrous now as it was of old ; the same it

was, only in another form.' Rome Papal is certainly as idolatrous, as cruel and bloody, as ever Rome Pagan was of old; yea, perhaps much more so beyond compare. Observe next, the rise and original is declared from whence this idolatrous church should spring, namely, *out of the bottomless pit*, because her working is after the working of Satan, with all deceivableness, with signs and lying wonders. And as its rise is declared, so is its ruin foretold, it *shall go into perdition*, that is, shall be finally destroyed, never to revive again: but before this destruction the world shall be under such an infatuation, that the generality of the inhabitants of the earth, some few excepted, *shall wonder after the beast*; that is, be wonderfully taken with him, and shall follow him with an implicit faith, paying homage and subjection to him. But these admirers and adorers of the beast are only such whose names were not written in the book of life; intimating to us, that in the times of greatest apostasy, and most universal defection from the truth, the Lord wants not his own true church: he ever had, and has, yea, ever will have, a number to stand up for his name, and bear witness to his truth.—*Burkitt on the New Testament*, Rev. xvii. 6—8.

(66.)—Bernard Gilpin, in a conversation with Neal was observing to him the great absurdity of the Romanists in condemning *idolatry* and yet countenancing such an use of images as must necessarily draw the people into it. For his part, he said, he knew not how a Christian could allow himself in kneeling to an image, and asked Neal, whether in his conscience he did not think it the idolatry forbidden in the second commandment. Neal was for distinguishing between an idol

and an image: The images of saints, he said, were not idols, and therefore the reverence paid to them could not be idolatry. Mr. Gilpin observed, that in the second commandment there was no mention made of an idol: the prohibition was—‘bow not down to the likeness of any created thing.’ And what is it, said he, that makes an idol? The workman makes the resemblance of a human creature, the image thus made is no idol; it is worship that makes it one. Hence the apostle says,—“an idol is nothing”—a mere creature of the imagination. The distinction, therefore, between Latria and Dulia is to no purpose. It is made void by the express words—“Thou shalt not bow down unto them.” The very posture of adoration, he observed, was forbidden; and that at least the Romanists every where practised. To all this, Neal had only one general answer: ‘You may say what you please, but these things are established by the church and cannot be altered.’

(67.)—I shall next examine the doctrine and practice of Saint worship, Image worship, Relic worship, and Cross worship.

In exhibiting the tenets of the Romish Church and clergy on these several points, I shall successively give: the decision of the council of Trent; the comments of some of the most approved latin doctors; and the actual practice of the Romanists themselves as the best explanation of their received tenets.

Let us first hear the decision of the council of Trent. “All bishops, and others who discharge the duty of teaching, must diligently instruct the faithful concerning the intercession and invocation of the saints, the

honouring of relics, and the legitimate use of images.

For this purpose, they must teach them : that the saints, reigning with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men ; and that it is good and useful, suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers and assistance for the purpose of obtaining benefits from God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.

Furthermore, they must teach them ; that these, who deny that the saints in heaven ought to be invoked, or who assert either that they do not pray for men or that the invoking of them to pray for us is idolatry or that it is contrary to God's word and adverse to the honour of Jesus Christ the only mediator between God and man, or that it is foolish by voice or in mind to supplicate those who reign in heaven, think impiously.

They must also teach them : that the holy bodies of the saints and martyrs and others living with Christ are to be venerated by the faithful, through which many benefits are afforded from God to men ; so that the affirmers, that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints, or that these and other sacred monuments are uselessly honoured by the faithful, or that it is vain to celebrate the memories of the saints for the purpose of obtaining their assistance, are wholly to be condemned, as the church long since condemned and still condemns them.

Likewise, they must teach them : that the images of Christ and of the Virgin Mother of God and of the other saints are especially to be had and retained in Churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be paid to them ; not that any divinity or virtue, on account of which they ought to be worshipped, is believed to be inherent in them ; or that any thing is to be sought from them ; or that trust is to be placed in

images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in Idols; but because the honour, which is paid to them, is referred to the originals which they represent; so that, through the Images which we kiss and before which we uncover our heads and bow down prostrate, we adore Christ and venerate the saints whose similitude they bear."

Let us next, upon the doctrinal and practical system of the professedly unchangeable Church of Rome, hear the comments of some of the most approved Latin Doctors both before and after the Council of Trent.

From Thomas Aquinas, who was not only a mighty schoolman but also a canonised saint of the Roman Church, we may clearly hope to derive the very best and most accurate instruction as to the *real* tenets of his communion. Now this writer, through the medium of a syllogism professedly framed upon an authorised Prayer in the Breviary, establishes the *duty* of worshipping the cross with the self-same adoration as that which is paid to the Deity.

"We offer the supreme adoration of Latria to that Being, in whom we place our hope of salvation. But we place our hope of salvation in the cross of Christ; for the church sings; Hail, O cross, our only hope in this time of passion, increase righteousness to the pious, and grant pardon to the guilty. Therefore, the cross of Christ is to be adored with the supreme adoration of Latria."

Much wholesome instruction, in regard to the legitimate use of images, may also be derived from the expository comment of James Naclantus, Bishop of Clugium.

"We must not only confess, that the faithful in the church worship before an image; as some over squeamish souls might peradventure express themselves; but

we must furthermore confess, without the slightest scruple of conscience, that *they adore the very image itself*; for, in sooth, they venerate it with the identical worship wherewith they venerate its prototype. Hence, if they adore the prototype with that divine worship which is rendered to God and which technically bears the name of Latria, they adore also the image with the same Latria or supreme divine worship: and, if they adore the prototype with Dulia or Hyperdulia, they are bound also to adore the image with the self-same species of inferior worship."

In exactly the same expository strain proceeds Gabriel Biel, in his lectures upon the Canon of the Mass.

If there shall be images of Christ, they are adored with the same species of adoration as Christ himself, that is, with the supreme adoration called Latria: if of the most blessed Virgin; with the worship of Hyperdulia.

The commentary of Peter de Medrano will throw yet additional light on the subject.

"We must say: that, to our Lady the Mother of God, there has been granted the remarkable privilege of being physically and really present in some of her statues and images.—Hence we must piously believe: that, in some celebrated statues or images of herself, she is inherent and present, personally, physically, and really;—in order that, in them, she may receive, from faithful worshippers, her due adoration."

Yet still further light breaks in upon us from the statements of Aringhi, penned and published at Rome under the very nose of the sovereign Pontiff.

"This image, translated from the city of Edessa, is at once preserved as a bulwark against mad Image breakers, and is set forth to be taken up and adored by the faithful.

Within these few years, under every pope successively, some or other of our sacred images, especially of the more ancient, have made themselves illustrious, and have acquired a peculiar worship and veneration, by the exhibition of fresh miracles; as it is notorious to all, who dwell in this city."

Let us finally attend to the actual liturgical practice of the Romanists themselves, as the best explanation of the tenets received and inculcated by their Clergy: for, clearly, as men are taught to believe and to act, so will their authorised public prayers be constructed.

"Hail, O cross, our only hope in this time of passion: increase righteousness to the pious and grant pardon to the guilty.

Holy Mary, succour the miserable, assist the pusillanimous, comfort the mournful.

O singular Virgin, mild among all, make us, being delivered from our sins, mild and chaste. Grant us purity of life; prepare for us a safe journey; that seeing Jesus, we may always jointly rejoice.

Mary, mother of grace, mother of mercy, do thou protect us from the enemy, and receive us in the hour of death. Unloose their bonds to the guilty; give light to the blind: drive away our evils: demand all good things. Shew thyself to be a mother. Let him, who for us endured to be thy son, receive our prayers through thee.

O George, illustrious martyr, praise and glory become thee.— We beseech thee, in our inmost heart, that, with all the faithful, we may be joined to the citizens of heaven, being washed from our impurities.

O martyr Christopher, for the honour of the Saviour, make us in mind worthy of the honour of the Deity. According to the promise of Christ, for what thou

asked thou obtainest, grant unto thy sorrowful people the gifts, which in dying thou besoughtest.

O ye eleven thousand glorious girls, lilies of virginity, roses of martyrdom, defend me in life by granting me your assistance : and shew yourselves in death, by bringing the last comfort.

O Holy Mary, our sovereign queen, as God the Father, by his omnipotence, has made thee most powerful ; so assist us, at the hour of death, by defending us against all power that is contrary to thine. Hail, Mary ! O Holy Mary, our sovereign queen, as God the Son has endowed thee with so much knowledge and charity that it enlightens all heaven ; so, in the hour of death, illustrate and strengthen our souls with the knowledge of the true faith, that they may not be perverted by error or pernicious ignorance, Hail, Mary ! O Holy Virgin, our sovereign queen ; as the Holy Ghost has plentifully poured forth into thee the love of God ; so instil into us, at the hour of death, the sweetness of divine love, that all bitterness at that time may become acceptable and pleasant to us. Hail, Mary !

Hail Mary, lady and mistress of the world, to whom all power has been given both in heaven and in earth !”

After this ample statement of the doctrine and practice of the Roman Church, it will be useful for us to observe, both negatively what the Bible does not say, and positively what the Bible does say on the subject now before us.

In the first place, then, so far as respects the negative part of the question, the Bible is totally silent, as to the Trent-inculcated duty, of invoking saints, venerating relics, and kissing and uncovering the head and falling prostrate before images either in niches or upon crucifixes.

It no where recognises or recommends any such practices and notions : as those of invoking dead saints, to aid us by their prayers, or to grant us purity of life, or to unloose the bands of the guilty, or to make us mild and chaste, or to defend us in life, or to assist us in the hour of death : of celebrating their memories, for the avowed purpose of obtaining their help and protection ; of much benefit being derived, from God to man by the veneration of relics ; of worshipping Christ and venerating the saints, through the medium of worship and veneration paid relatively to images ; of beseeching the cross, a mere dumb piece of wood even if any of its remains should now be actually in existence, to increase righteousness to the pious and to grant pardon to the guilty.

From beginning to end, not a syllable of sanction or approbation, in regard to any such phantasies can we discover in the Holy Scriptures.

Hence, even to say the very least of the matter, the doctrine, avowedly taught and liturgically introduced by the Church of Rome, has not the slightest support or warrant from the written word of God. Whatever be the ground, upon which it rests ; at all events it clearly rests not upon the Bible.

But this is not all. For, in the second place, so far as respects the positive part of the question. Holy scripture is full and express against any worship or invocation of the creature, however disguised or modified or palliated by the closely harmonizing distinctions and definitions of paganism and popery ; inasmuch as the Pagans, though slanderously misrepresented by the doctors of the council of Trent, did in truth defend their idol worship against the primitive Christians, on the self-same plea and principle of relative adoration, as the said doctors themselves and their followers the

Romish clergy defend their image worship against us reformed catholics.

“Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them : for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments. *Exod. xx. 4—6.*

Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman. *Deut. xxvii. 15.*

They that make a graven image, are all of them vanity ; and their delectable things shall none of them profit : and they are their own witnesses ; they see not nor know ; that they may be ashamed. *Isa. xliv. 9.* See also *Psalm cxxxv. 15—18.*

None considereth in his heart, neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say : I have burned part of it in the fire ; yea also I have baked bread upon the coals thereof ; I have roasted flesh, and eaten it : and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination ; shall I fall down to the stock of a tree ? *Isa. xliv. 19.*

What profiteth the graven image, that the maker thereof hath graven it : the molten image, and a teacher of lies, that the maker of his work trusteth therein to make dumb idols ? Woe unto him that saith to the wood ; Awake : to the dumb stone ; Arise, it shall teach. Behold, it is laid over with gold and silver ; and there is no breath at all in the midst of it. *Habak. ii. 18, 19.*

Then said Jesus unto him : Get thee hence, Satan :

for it is written ; Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Matt. iv. 10.

Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind. Coloss. ii. 18.

When I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me ; See thou do it not ; for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book. Worship God. Rev. xxii. 8, 9.

When the people saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying in the speech of Lycaonia : The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men. And they called Barnabas Jupiter ; and Paul Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker.

Then the priest of Jupiter, which was before their city, brought oxen and garlands unto the gates, and would have done sacrifice with the people. Which when the apostles Barnabas and Paul heard of, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out and saying : Sirs, why do ye these things ? We also are men of like passions with you ; and preach unto you, that ye should turn away from these vanities unto the living God. Acts xiv. 10—15."

We may now profitably hear the testimony of the early ecclesiastical writers.

The Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, relative to the martyrdom of Polycarp, was written about the middle of the second century.

Nicetas was urged by the envious and the wicked to intercede with the governor, that the remains of Polycarp should not be delivered for sepulture : lest, leaving him that was crucified, the Christians, it was

suggested, should begin to worship this person. These things they said, at the instigation of the Jews: because they were ignorant, that neither can we ever forsake Christ who suffered for the salvation of the saved throughout the whole world, nor that we can ever worship any other. For him, being the Son of God, we adore : but the martyrs, as disciples and imitators of the Lord, we worthily love on account of their special affection to their own King and Master.

Clement of Alexandria flourished in the second century.

“ Images, wrought by mean artizans, are produced from worthless materials. Therefore they themselves must be worthless and profane.

An image, truly is mere dead matter, fashioned by the hand of the artizan. But, with us Christians, there is no sensible representation formed out of sensible matter. God, the alone true God, is our intellectual image.”

Minucius Felix lived in the third century.

“ Why have the Christians no altars, no temples, no known images ?

We neither worship crosses, nor wish for them.”

Origen lived in the third century.

Celsus remarks, that we have neither altars, nor images, nor temples. We ought not to dedicate images constructed by the ingenuity of artizans.

“ We deem those the most ignorant, who are not ashamed to address lifeless images, to petition the weak for help, to ask life from the dead, to pray for wealth from the needy. And, though some may allege, that these images are not gods, but only their symbols and representations ; yet even such persons, fancying that imitations of the Deity can be made by the hands of some mean artisan, are not a whit less ignorant and

slavish and uninstructed. From this sottish stupidity, the very lowest and least informed of Christians are exempt."

The Council of Elvira sat at the beginning of the fourth century.

"It hath seemed good to us, that pictures ought not to be admitted into a church: lest that should be painted upon walls which is worshipped and adored."

Athanasius flourished in the fourth century.

"We are truly worshippers of God: because we invoke no one of the creatures nor any mere man, but the Son who is by nature from God and true God."

Augustine lived in the fourth and fifth centuries.

"Let not our point of religion be the worship of dead men. For though they lived piously; still they are not to be accounted of, as requiring from us any such honours: but they rather wish us to worship him, through whose illumination they rejoice that we should be partners of their merit. They are to be honoured, therefore, on account of imitation; not to be prayed to on account of religion.

I have known that many are adorers of sepulchres and pictures: but the church herself condemns them, and as bad children studies to correct them."

Epiphanius flourished in the fourth century.

"Let Mary be held in honour: but let the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost be worshipped. As for Mary let no one worship her."

Once more, let the honest inquirer freely judge and determine for himself, whether the doctrine and practice of the Roman Church and Clergy, relative to Saints and Images, and Relics and Crosses, be supported either by Holy Scripture or by Primitive Antiquity.—*Facts and Assertions by Rev. G. S. Faber.*
Published by the Christian Knowledge Society.

(68.)—Dr. Chalmers is far too able a divine not to know much better than I can tell him, that, by the unanimous consent of Protestant Expositors in every age and country, the apocalyptic harlot, is the corrupt and blood-stained, and domineering Church of Rome.

. . . From this corrupt church the people of God are solemnly warned to come out, and the assigned reason of the warning is, first, lest they should be partakers of her sins, and then secondly, lest they should receive of her predicted, and now rapidly approaching plagues. The Holy Spirit enjoins *separation from an idolatrous communion*.—*Rev. G. S. Faber's letter in answer to Dr. Chalmers' Speech.*

(69.)—. . . We must expect God to punish us for connexion with idolatry, which is a sin against God as the moral Governor of the world, just as he did the children of Israel. Remember, that immediately Solomon connected himself with idolatry, the peace of the country was at an end. God raised up enemies that harassed him all the remaining days of his life. The offence which caused God to send the children of Israel into captivity, and finally sweeping away their ten tribes from the world of nations was idolatry. The case of Jehoshaphat was a remarkable illustration of the evil to be expected from the compromise of principle. The alliance of that monarch with idolatrous Ahab was the means and cause of the introduction of idolatry into Judah. From whatever soil, whatever land, people, nation, or tongue the cry of idolatry arises to heaven as a protest against that land or nation, certain are we that the response of wrath and Divine anger will speedily follow. So that if Popery be idolatry, (and if it be not, then every

Reformed Church has been, and is, in error, gross and antichristian error,) our alliance with that system, our fraternizing with that Church, must, and will bring down upon us the judgments of God denounced against idolatry.—*From a Speech of Mr. Gordon's at a Protestant Meeting held at Exeter Hall, March 28, 1838.*

(70.)—The constitution of Britain was established by our Protestant forefathers on the following declaration against Popery, to be made by the Sovereign in the presence of the Houses of Parliament:—‘I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, testify and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever. And that the invocation and adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome are *superstitious* and *idolatrous*.’ To this was added an oath taken by the King, the Members of the Legislature, and even by the Members of Corporations, to their belief that the invocation and adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass as they are now used in the Church of Rome are *superstitious* and *idolatrous*.

(71.)— . . We admit that the charge we bring against the Romish Church is a most fearful one. We admit that we charge that church with depriving God of his honour, and transferring the worship and adoration which should be paid to Him alone, to divers of his

creatures, who were and are nothing but poor human beings like ourselves.

We commence the inquiry then, by first lodging our formal accusation, that the Church of Rome, by her worship and adoration of the Virgin Mary and of sundry dead men and women, called 'saints,' does in effect, rob Christ of his peculiar glory ; affront the God and Father of our Lord, who hath "given him for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles," and set at nought the Holy Ghost, whose office it is to glorify Christ and to shed abroad his love in our hearts. In short, that another worship distinct from, and opposed to, the worship of the blessed Trinity is set up, a worship as entirely distinct from and opposed to, the worship of the only true God, as was the worship of the heroes and demigods of ancient Greece and Rome.—*Essays on Romanism, by a Layman*, p. 330.

(72.)— . . . The Romish controversialist may define what he calls *latría* and what he calls *dulia* ; but the poor mechanic or the simple child knows only one thing, which is *worship*. This worship he pays to a piece of wafer, when uplifted by the priest at what he calls 'the altar.' He pays it again before the image of the virgin, so soon as the 'mass' is over. He then returns home, and before he sleeps, he says his rosary, which includes a vain and senseless repetition of the Lord's Prayer *ten* times ; but a still more senseless address to the virgin of *fifty* prayers. All that is really accomplished by this idle ceremony, is the offering an insult to God, by elevating Mary to greater honour than her Creator and Redeemer ! But ask this poor deluded votary touching the difference be-

tween his prayers to God and to the virgin. What can he tell you, beyond the verbal distinction that one is *latría* and the other *dulia*? Practically, however, there is no real difference; or if there be any, it consists in a greater degree of faith and hope, exercised with respect to his addresses to Mary, than with reference to those to God or to Christ. He believes,—he is *taught* to believe, that Mary's ears are more open to his cry, that her heart more readily sympathizes with his wants and his sorrows, than does the heart of his Saviour. And therefore, it is that this idol-worship is so universally a favourite among these poor people. 'The rosary,' says Mr. O'Croly, (a Romish priest) 'which should be called their devotion to the virgin, forms the sum total of their religious worship.' And, placed in this elevated rank, as hiding the Saviour almost wholly from the sinner's view, it could not be otherwise than dreadfully offensive to God, even were it less sinful and unscriptural in itself. But when we remember that this worship, which, it is thus admitted, absorbs and swallows up the whole soul of devotion among the people, is in itself altogether opposed to the word of God, to reason, and to common sense, and can rank no higher, with any rightly-judging man, than the worship of Juno or of Minerva among the ancient heathen, how frightful does the view become! The whole church, falsely called 'Catholic,' bowing down with one consent before the effigy of a poor human creature! Men and women, called Christians, addressing, from the four quarters of the globe, prayers to one who cannot hear them! Priests and laity, in all parts of the world, calling upon her as 'the Queen of heaven,' 'the Empress of the universe; their Life, their Hope, the great Mediator between Christ and sinners!'

And as the result of the whole, that result which is Satan's grand aim, the Saviour disregarded ; scarcely ever addressed in prayer, or when so addressed, insulted with the petition, that he will do so and so, in respect to the merits of St. Clementina or St. Carlino, or some other poor creature, whose salvation, if achieved at all, was solely his own work, and the reward of his own sufferings ! No ! it is impossible for any calm and unbiassed mind, to contemplate seriously the habitual worship of the poor Romanist, without being convinced, that the worship of God has been superseded and pushed aside among them ; and that it is replaced by another worship, the worship of dead men and women, which is neither more nor less than *idolatry*.—*Ibid.* p. 376—378.

(73.)— . . . After all this, if their doctrines, as they are explicated by their practice, and the commentaries of their greatest doctors, do make their disciples guilty of idolatry, there is not any thing greater to deter men from them, than that danger to their souls which is imminent over them upon that account.

Their worshipping of images we have already re-proved upon the account of its novelty and innovation in Christian religion. But that it is against good life, a direct breach of the second commandment, an act of idolatry, *as much as the heathen themselves were guilty of*, in relation to the second commandment, is but too evident by the doctrines of their own leaders.

For if to give divine honour to a creature be idolatry, then the doctors of the Church of Rome teach their people to commit idolatry : for they affirm, that the same worship which is given to the prototype or principal, the same is to be given to the image of it. As

we worship the Holy Trinity and Christ, so we may worship the images of the Trinity and of Christ; that is, with *latria*, or divine honour. 'This is the constant sentence of the divines, The image is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship with which we worship those whose image it is,' said Azorius, their great master of casuistical theology.—*A Dissuasive from Popery by Bishop Jeremy Taylor*: see *Enchiridion Theologicum Anti-Romanum*. Vol. i. p. 115.

(74.)—... We are not unskilled in the devices of the Roman writers, and with how much artifice they would excuse this whole matter (image worship) and palliate the crime imputed to them, and elude the scriptures expressly condemning this superstition: but we know also, that the arts of sophistry are not the ways of salvation. And therefore we exhort our people to follow the plain words of scripture, and the express law of God in the second commandment; and add also the exhortation of St. John:—*Little children, keep yourselves from idols*.—*Ibid.* p. 48.

PART III.

ON THE ANTICHRISTIAN CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

**"THE SEE (OF ROME) IS THE SEAT OF SATAN, AND THE BISHOP OF THE SAME THAT
MAINTAINETH THE ABOMINATIONS THEREOF, IS ANTICHRIST HIMSELF INDEED."
—BISHOP RIDLEY.**

**"AS FOR THE POPE I REFUSE HIM AS CHRIST'S ENEMY, AND THE ANTICHRIST WITH
ALL HIS FALSE DOCTRINE."—ABP. CRANMER.**

PART III.

ON THE ANTICHRISTIAN CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

(75.)—AMONG the more remarkable prophecies concerning the Christian Church, there are several which describe the rise, progress, and downfall of a certain power, represented under various symbols or images, and distinguished by many appellations; but more especially known by the name of ANTICHRIST.

... It is admitted, that many predictions in the Old and New Testament, particularly in the book of Daniel, in St. Paul's Epistles, and in the Revelations of St. John, clearly point out a very extraordinary power, which was to manifest itself *in the latter times*, that is, in the times subsequent to the introduction of Christianity. The character, by which this power (acknowledged by all under the name of Antichrist) is chiefly distinguished, are those of *Tyranny, Idolatry, and Intolerance*. And, to abridge our trouble in searching after this *three-headed monster*, we are directed by the prophets to look for him within the boundaries of what was properly called the Roman Empire, and even in the city of Rome itself. Thus far there is no dispute. The only question is, to what Roman power, exhibiting those characters, the prophecies are to be applied. And even this ques-

tion is reduced within narrow limits ; for *two* powers only have subsisted in Rome, from the Christian æra to the present times (within which period we are, again, allowed to expect the reign of Antichrist ;) the Roman Emperor, in the first place ; and afterwards, the Roman Pontiffs. So that on the whole, the single point in debate is merely this, whether Imperial, or Papal Rome, be that Antichristian power, which the prophets foretold. The Church of Rome holds, for obvious reasons, that the *Imperial* power is the object of the prophecies : the Protestants have on the contrary, their reasons for maintaining that Papal Rome is that power, which the prophecies had in view, and in which alone they are truly and properly verified.

. . . So early, as about the close of the sixth century, Gregory the first, or, the Great, as he is usually called, the most revered, and in some respects not undeservedly so, of all the Roman Pontiffs, in a famous dispute with the Bishop of Constantinople who had taken to himself the title of Œcumenical, or Universal Bishop, objects to him, the arrogance and presumption of this claim, and treats him, on that account, as the fore-runner, at least of Antichrist. His words are remarkable enough to be here quoted. ‘ I affirm it confidently,’ says he, ‘ that whoever calls himself universal bishop, or is desirous to be so called, demonstrates himself, by this pride, and elation of heart, to be the fore-runner of Antichrist.’ And again, ‘ From this presumption of his’ (in taking the name of universal bishop) ‘ what else can be collected, but that the times of Antichrist are now at hand ?’ It is to be observed of this Gregory, that he disclaimed, for himself, the title of universal bishop, as well as refused it to his aspiring brother of Constantinople. How consistently he did this, when at the same time, he exer-

cised an authority, which can only belong to that exalted character, it is not my business to inquire. Perhaps, he did not advert to the consequence of his own actions : perhaps, like an able man, he meant to secure the thing, without troubling himself about the name : perhaps, he was jealous of a rival, to this claim of catholic authority, and would not permit the Bishop of Constantinople to decorate himself with a title, which was likely to be favourable to the pretensions of that see, and injurious to his own. Whatever the reasons of his conduct were, the *fact* is, as I here represent it, and clearly shews that, in the judgment of this renowned Roman bishop, Antichrist had not yet been revealed in the person of the Roman emperor, and if ever he were to be revealed, that not a civil, but ecclesiastical character, agreed best with the prophetic descriptions of him.

Pope Boniface III. had not, it seems, the scruples whatever they were, of his predecessor, Gregory. He readily accepted, or rather importunately begged, this proud title of Œcumenical Bishop, from the emperor, Phocas ; and transmitted it to all his successors. And now, it might be expected, that the Bishop of Rome would be Antichrist in his turn. But, such was the fortune of that see, or the devotion of the faithful to it, that this charge was not presently brought against him : as if the spirit of dominion, which had so long possessed that city, were a thing of course, and could not misbecome the Bishop of Rome, though it looked so *Antichristian* in him of Constantinople.

Other reasons occurred to save the honour of the papal chair. Its authority grew, every day, more absolute : and the tradition of the Church (which had hitherto been the chief support of the doctrine concerning Antichrist) gradually sunk under the apprehension

of that power, to which alone it could, with any apparent propriety, be applied: while the ignorance of the times became such, that, except perhaps in the minds of some few retainers to the See of Rome, there was scarce light enough left in the Christian world to point out the meaning of the prophecies; if its gross superstition would have otherwise permitted the application of them to the sacred person of the pope.

Under the cover of all these advantages, the *Man of Sin* had a convenient time to display himself, and to grow up into that full size and stature, in which he could no longer be overlooked, or mistaken, by those who had any knowledge of the prophecies, or skill in applying them. Accordingly we find that at the Synod of Rheims, held in the tenth century, Arnulphus, Bishop of Orleans, appealed to the whole council, whether the Bishop of Rome were not the Antichrist of the prophets; *sitting in the temple of God*; and perfectly corresponding to the marks, which St. Paul had given of him. In particular speaking of John the XVth. who then governed the Church of Rome, he apostrophized the assembly in these words:—What think ye, reverend Fathers, of this man, seated on a lofty throne, and shining in purple and gold? Whom do ye account him to be? Surely, if destitute of charity, and puffed up with the pride of science only, He is ANTICHRIST, *sitting in the temple of God, and shewing himself that he is God.*

In the former part of the eleventh century, Berengarius, a man of principal note in those days, and distinguished by his free writings concerning the Eucharist, went so far as to call the Church of Rome, *the seat of Satan*, which is but another apocalyptic name of Antichrist; and to know from what source he derived this language, we need only reflect, that in the

catalogue of his works, we find a Treatise written by him expressly on the book of Revelations.

As this century advanced, the papal power rose to its height. And all the characters of Antichrist glared so strongly in the person of Hildebrand, who took the name of Gregory VIIth that the Romish historian Joannes Aventinus, speaks of it as a point, in *which the generality of fair, candid, and ingenuous writers were agreed, that, THEN began the empire of Antichrist.*

Pascal II. who had been brought up at the feet of Hildebrand, and sat upon the papal throne in the beginning of the twelfth century, was treated with as little ceremony, as his master had been; particularly by Fluentius, Bishop of Florence, and by the whole Church of Liege.

St. Bernard, too, the most eminent person of that age, was so struck with the marks of Antichristianism in the Church of Rome, to which, however, in other respects, he was enough devoted, that he employed all the thunder of his rhetoric, in which faculty he excelled, against its corruptions; exclaiming *that the ministers of Christ were become the servants of Antichrist; and that the beast of the Apocalypse had seated himself in the chair of St. Peter.*

But this charge was, now, so general and sounded so high, that it reached the ears of *others*, besides prelates, and churchmen. Historians relate, that it made an impression on our military king Richard I. ; who being at Messina in Sicily, in his way to the Holy Land, and hearing much of the learned Abbot Joachim of Calabria, a man famous in those times for his warm invectives against the Roman hierarchy; had the curiosity to take a lecture from him on this subject. His text was *Antichrist and the Apocalypse* : which he ex-

plained in so pointed and forcible a manner, as was much to the satisfaction, we are told, of his royal auditor.

The first appearance of the people called Waldenses or Albigenses, was in this age ; but in the next, the thirteenth century, they prevailed to that degree, that Crusades and Inquisitions were thought little enough to be employed against them. We may know what the guilt of this people was, when we understand from their books, and from the testimony of the great historian, Thuanus, that a leading principle of their heresy was, to treat the pope as *Antichrist* ; and the Church of Rome, as *Babylon* ; on the authority of the prophecies contained in the Revelations.

Other testimonies occur in the history of this age. But I must not omit that of our famous historian, Matthew Paris ; who hath taken care to inform us, that his contemporary, Robert Grostete, Bishop of Lincoln, the most considerable of all the English Bishops, and equally renowned for his affection to civil and religious liberty, was so much in earnest in fixing this charge on the see of Rome, that as it had been the common theme of his meditations during life, so it occupied his dying moments : the Pope and Antichrist being, as he tells us, among the last words of this zealous prelate.

The fourteenth century affords many authorities in point ; among which the immortal names of Dante and Petrarch are commonly cited. But the example of our Wickliff, who adorned that age, is most to our purpose, and may excuse the mention of any other. This extraordinary man saw far into all the abuses of his time : but he had nothing more at heart than to expose the *Antichristianism* of the Roman pontiff. Still as the times grew more enlightened, the controversy con-

cerning Antichrist became more general and important. The writings of Wickliff had great effects both at home and abroad; and with other causes contributed very much to the cultivation of free inquiry, and to the improvement of all useful knowledge in the fifteenth century. The church of Rome was pushed vigorously on all sides; and, in her turn, omitted no means of self-defence. That the *worst* were not scrupled, may be seen by what passed in England, at that time, as well as by the sanguinary and faithless proceedings at the council of Constance. Lord Cobham and the two Bohemian martyrs, were committed to the flames for nothing so much, as for asserting the impious doctrine, ‘That the pope was Antichrist.’

We now enter the sixteenth century; distinguished in the annals of mankind by that great event, the Reformation of long-oppressed and much-adulterated religion. The Christian world had slumbered in its chains, for full ten ages. But liberty came at last—

‘*Libertas, quæ sera tamen respexit inertim.*’

This important work was begun and prosecuted, on the common principle, that the Bishop of Rome was Antichrist: and the great separation from the church of Rome was everywhere justified on the idea, that Rome was the Babylon of the Revelations; and that Christians were bound by an express command in those prophecies, to *come out of her communion*.

Leo Xth was thunder-struck with this cry, which resounded on all sides; and, in the last Lateran Council, gave it in charge to all preachers, that none of them should presume to call the Pope, antichrist, or to treat this obnoxious subject in their discourses to the people. But his edict came too late. The

notion had taken deep root in the minds of men; and the name of Antichrist, as applied to the Pope, was current in all quarters.

From this time to the present, the charge of anti-christianism against the Church of Rome is to be regarded, not as the language of private men, or particular synods; but as the common voice of the whole Protestant world: so that it will be needless to bring down the history of it any lower.

1. It may seem probable from the general prevalence of this opinion, in all the periods of the Christian Church, that it must needs have some solid ground in the Scriptural prophecies: it not being otherwise conceivable, that it should spread so far, and continue so long; or that the more enlightened, as well as barbarous ages should concur in the profession of it.

2. From the catalogue of illustrious names, here produced, and from the singular stress, which all Protestant churches to this day have ever laid on this principle, we may see the importance of the general question. The papal divines have an evident reason for treating it with contempt. The men of thought and inquiry, who speculate within the Roman communion, may be restrained by considerations of fear or decency, from joining in this invidious charge against the head of their church. But for any, that profess Christianity, and call themselves Protestants, to make light of inquiries into the prophecies concerning Antichrist, and to manifest a scorn of all attempts to apply them in the way, in which they have so generally, and with such effect been applied, is a sort of conduct, which will not so readily find an excuse, much less a justification.

3. Whatever becomes of the *truth*, or *importance* of the doctrine, the *antiquity* of it is not to be disputed.

For we are authorised to affirm, on the most certain grounds of history, that a Roman power, commonly called Antichrist, was expected to arise in *the latter times*, by the primitive Christians; and that the Imperial, was not deemed to be that power, so long as it subsisted. It is, further unquestionable that not the emperor, but the Bishop or Church of Rome, was afterwards thought entitled to the name of Antichrist by many persons of that communion, for several successive centuries, previous to the era of the Reformation.

These facts should abate the wonder at least, which some express at hearing the names of the Pope and Antichrist pronounced together. They must surely convince every man that this language, whatever foundation it may, or may not have, in the prophecies, is not taken up without precedents and authorities; and that the notion conveyed by it, is not a conceit of yesterday, which sprung out of recent prejudices, and novel interpretations. . . .

. . . It is well known that when the Reformation was set on foot in the sixteenth century, this great work was everywhere justified and conducted on the general principle, 'that the Pope, or at least the Church of Rome, was Antichrist.'

. . . The Reformers did not innovate in the interpretation of the prophecies concerning Antichrist; their application of them to the see of Rome, was not a contrivance, which sprung out of the passionate resentments, or interested policies of that time. It is true indeed, (for the truth should not, and needs not be concealed) that the Reformers were forward enough to lay hold on this received sense of the prophecies, and to make their utmost advantage of it; the account of which matter is briefly, this. The Christian Church

had now for many ages been held together in a close dependence on the chair of St. Peter ; and to secure and perpetuate that dependence was the principal object and concern of the papal court. Various means were employed for this purpose ; but the most effectual was thought to be, to inculcate in the strongest terms on the minds of Christians the absolute necessity of communicating with the Bishop of Rome, as the centre of unity, and, by divine appointment, the supreme visible head of the Christian world. Hence, to renounce in any degree the authority and jurisdiction of Rome, was deemed the most inexpressible of all sins. The name of *Schism* was fastened upon it ; a name, which was sounded higher than that of heresy itself, as implying in it the accumulated guilt of apostasy and infidelity. The way of heaven was shut against all offenders of this sort ; and, to make their condition as miserable, as it was hopeless, all the engines of persecution, such as racks, fires, gibbets, inquisitions, and even crusades had been employed against them ; as was seen in the case of the Albigenses and others, who, at different times had attempted to withdraw themselves from the papal dominion.

Such was the state of things, when the bold spirit of Luther resolved, at all adventures, to break through this inveterate servitude, so dexterously imposed on the Christian world, under the pretence, and in the name, of ecclesiastical union. Yet the peril of the attempt was easily foreseen, or was presently felt ; and therefore, the Reformers, to prevent the ill effects which the dreadful name of *Schism* might have on themselves and their cause, and to satisfy at once their own consciences, and those of their adherents, not only revived and enforced the old charge of *Antichristianism*

against the Church of Rome ; but further insisted, on the authority of those prophecies which justified the charge, that Christians were bound in conscience, by the most express command, to break all communion with her. The expedient, one sees, was well calculated to serve the purpose in hand : but still the command was truly and pertinently alleged ; for it exists in so many words, however the blindness, or the bigotry of former times had overlooked it, in the book of the Revelations. (‘ Come out of her my people,’ &c.) So that whoever admitted the *charge* itself to be well founded, could not reject this *consequence* of it, that Christ and Antichrist had no fellowship with each other. And on this popular ground chiefly, the Protestant cause, in those early times, was upheld, with no small advantage to the patrons of it ; it being now clear, that the invidious imputation of schism had lost its malignity in the general obligation, which lay upon Christians, to renounce all communion with the Church of Rome.

This being the true account of that zeal with which the doctrine of Antichrist was asserted in the days of the Reformation, let us see how the case stands at present ; and whether any reasonable prejudice lies against the doctrine itself, from the uses, that were then so happily made of it.

In the first place, the injunction *to come out of her*, was, as I observed, not forged by the Reformers ; nor, admitting that church to be Antichristian, was it misrepresented by them. Every reader of the prophecies must confess, that the command is clearly delivered, and that the sense of it is not mistaken. How serviceable soever, therefore, this topic was to the cause of reformation, it is not, on that account, to be the less esteemed by the just and candid inquirer.

In the next place I will freely admit, that the dread, in which most men, if not all men, of that time, were held, of incurring the imputation of schism, was much greater, than the occasion required, and, upon the whole, a sort of panic terror. For, though a causeless separation from the church would indeed have loaded the reformers with much and real guilt, yet when the abuses of it had risen to that height as to reduce an honest man to the alternative, either of committing sin, or of leaving its communion, they might well have justified themselves on the evident necessity of the thing, and had no need of a positive command to authorise their separation. All this is, now, clearly seen ; and if the first reformers did not see thus much, as very probably they did not, all that follows, is, that the doctrine of Antichrist, from which that command derived its effect, was less necessary to their cause, than they supposed it to be ; not, that the doctrine itself is without authority, or the command without obligation.

. . . The prophecies seem very clearly to point it (the Roman power) out to us, as an *ecclesiastical*, and in name and pretence, at least, a *Christian power*.

. . . Another obvious character of Antichrist, or rather complication of characters is that triple brand, impressed upon him, of a tyrannical, intolerant, and idolatrous power.

The prophets hold him up to us, as reigning, or exercising an oppressive and supereminent dominion, over the kings of the earth, that is, of the western empire ; as making war with the lamb, and the saints who receive not his mark in their foreheads, that is, persecuting good and conscientious Christians, who refuse to wear the badge of Antichrist, and to serve under him ; and as another Babylon, the mother of

harlots and abominations of the earth, that is, as polluted himself with the grossest idolatry, and, as corrupting the nations with the same profane worship.

. . . To return, now, to the consideration of our three marks. These marks, it is said, agree to so many other powers, besides that of the papacy, that they cannot be made the peculiar, distinctive characters of Christian Rome. And, without doubt, considered merely in themselves, they cannot. But, having already understood that the power thus stigmatized, is a power seated in the *seven-hilled* city, and that too, an ecclesiastical power, one sees clearly that, if the prophecies have hitherto received their accomplishment in any degree, these marks can only be sought in Papal Rome, and must be the proper, exclusive characters of that power. I say, one sees this; but it must be owned, not without amazement, that a species of government, calling itself Christian, and professing to model itself on the example of the *Lamb*, on the pure and simple principles of the Gospel, should yet be all overstained with those specific vices, which Christianity most abhors—the utmost pride of secular domination—the most relentless zeal against the rights of conscience—and, what is still more incredible, the most blasphemous idolatry. The accumulated infamy of these crimes struck the prophet, St. John, so forcibly, that on the sight of this portentous monster, exhibited to him in the vision, he *wondered*, as himself expresses it, *with great admiration*.

But, strange as this vision appeared to the sacred prophet, the Papal history is found to realize all the wonders of it: and backward as *we* may be to interpret this vision of a church, professedly Christian, that church herself is so little scandalized at the imputation of these crimes, that she is ready to avow them all;

the two first directly and openly ; and the last, when set in a certain light, and explained in her own manner. In short, she prides herself in the *extent of her sway*, and the *fire of her zeal*, and only quibbles with us about the meaning of the term, *idolatry*.

. . . To draw, then, what hath been said on the several marks of Antichrist, to a point. Consider, within *what part* of the world, he was to appear ; in *what seat* or throne, he was to be established ; of *what kind*, his sovereignty was to be, with *what attributes*, he was to be invested ; in *what season*, or about *what time*, and for *how long a time*, he was to reign and prosper. Consider these *five* obvious characters of Antichrist, which the prophets have distinctly set forth, and which, from them I have successively held up to you ; and, then, compare them with the correspondent characters which you find inscribed by the pen of authentic history, on a certain power, sprung up in the west ; seated in the city of Rome ; calling himself the vicar of Christ ; yet *full of names of blasphemy*, that is, stigmatized with those crimes, which Christianity as such holds most opprobrious, the crimes of tyrannic dominion, of persecution, and even idolatry ; and lastly, now subsisting in the world, though with evident symptoms of decay, after a long reign, whose rise and progress can be traced, and whose duration hitherto, is uncontradicted by any prophecy : put, I say, all these correspondent marks together, and see if they do not furnish, if not an absolute demonstration, yet a high degree of probability, *that apostate papal Rome is the very Antichrist foretold*.

At least, you will admit that these correspondencies are signal enough to merit your attention, and even to justify your pains in looking further into so curious and interesting a subject. Ye will say to yourselves, that

the prophecies concerning Antichrist deserve at least to be considered with care, since in so many striking particulars, they appear, on the face of them, to have been completed.—*Bishop Hurd on the Prophecies*, 1772.

(76.)—*The man of sin* is the same arbitrary and wicked power that is described by Daniel under the characters of *the little horn* and *the mighty king*. In St. Paul “he is revealed,” when the Roman empire is “taken out of the way;” and in Daniel the Roman empire is first broken into several kingdoms, and “he cometh up among them.” In St. Paul “he opposeth;” and in Daniel “he doth according to his will,” and “weareth out the saints of the Most High.” In St. Paul “he exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, shewing himself that he is God:” and in Daniel “he exalteth himself and magnifieth himself above every god, and speaketh marvellous things against the God of gods.” In St. Paul he is “the lawless one;” and in Daniel “he changeth times and laws.” In St. Paul “his coming is with all deceivableness of unrighteousness; and in Daniel “he practiseth and prospereth, and through his policy causeth craft to prosper in his hand.” According to St. Paul “the Lord shall consume him with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy him with the brightness of his coming;” and according to Daniel “a fiery stream shall issue and come forth from the judge, and his body shall be given to the burning flame, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.” The characters and circumstances are so much the same, that they must belong to one and the same person.

The tyrannical power thus described by Daniel and St. Paul, and afterwards by St. John, is both by ancients and moderns generally denominated *Antichrist* : and the name is proper and expressive enough, as it may signify both *the enemy of Christ*, and *the vicar of Christ* ; and no one is more the enemy of Christ than he who arrogates his name and power, as no one more directly opposes the king than he who assumes his title and authority. The name began to prevail in St. John's time. For he addresseth himself to the Christians as having heard of the coming of Antichrist ; and calleth the heretics of his time by the same common name : (1 Ep. ii. 18. 22.) " As ye have heard that the Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists : Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ ? He is the Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." As St. Paul hath said, " the mystery of iniquity doth already work ;" so St. John speaketh of the spirit of Antichrist, as then in the world, (1 Ep. iv. 3.) " This is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof you have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." Afterwards (2 Ep. 7, 8.) he styleth emphatically " the deceiver and the Antichrist," and warneth the Christians to " look to themselves." The fathers too speak of Antichrist, and of the man of sin as one and the same person ; and give much the same interpretation that hath here been given of the whole passage : only it is not to be supposed that they who wrote before the events, could be so very exact in the application of each particular, as those who have the advantage of writing after the events, and of comparing the prophecy and completion together.

Justin Martyr, who flourished before the middle of the second century, considers *the man of sin*, or as he

elsewhere calleth him *the man of blasphemy*, as altogether the same with the little horn in Daniel : and affirms, that he who shall speak blasphemous words against the Most High, is now at the doors. Irenæus who lived in the same century, hath written a whole chapter of the fraud and pride, and tyrannical reign of Antichrist, as they are described by Daniel and St. Paul in his second epistle to the Thessalonians. Tertullian who became famous at the latter end of the same century, expounding those words “ only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way,” says, ‘ Who can this be but the Roman state, the division of which into ten kingdoms will bring on Antichrist, and then the wicked one shall be revealed.’ And in his Apology he assigns it as a particular reason why the Christians prayed for the Roman empire, because they knew that the greatest calamity hanging over the world was retarded by the continuance of it.

Origen, the most learned father and ablest writer of the third century, recites this passage at large as spoken of him who is called Antichrist. To the same purpose he likewise alleges the words of Daniel as truly divine and prophetic. Daniel and St. Paul, according to him, both prophesied of the same person.

Lactantius, who flourished in the beginning of the fourth century, describes Antichrist in the same manner, and almost in the same terms as St. Paul ; and concludes, This is he, who is called Antichrist, but shall feign himself to be Christ, and shall fight against the truth. A shorter and fuller character of the vicar of Christ could not be drawn even by a Protestant. Cyril of Jerusalem in the same century alleges this passage of St. Paul, together with other prophecies concerning Antichrist, and says that, This the predicted Antichrist will come, when the times of the Roman empire

shall be fulfilled, and the consummation of the world shall approach. Ten kings of the Romans shall arise together, in different places, indeed, but they shall reign at the same time. Among these the eleventh is Antichrist, who by magical and wicked artifice shall seize the Roman power. Ambrose, archbishop of Milan, in the same century, or Hilary the deacon, or the author (whoever he was) of the comment upon St. Paul's epistles, which passeth under the name of St. Ambrose, proposes much the same interpretation, and affirms that after the failing or decay of the Roman empire Antichrist shall appear.

Jerome, Austin and Chrysostome flourished in the latter end of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth century. St. Jerome in his explanation of this passage says that Antichrist shall sit in the temple of God, either at Jerusalem (as some imagine) or in the church (as we more truly judge) shewing himself that he is Christ and the Son of God : and unless the Roman empire be first desolated and Antichrist precede, Christ shall not come—"And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time," that is, ye know very well, what is the reason, why Antichrist doth not come at present. He is not willing to say openly, that the Roman empire should be destroyed, which they who command think to be eternal.—For if he had said openly and boldly, that Antichrist shall not come, unless the Roman empire be first destroyed, it might probably have proved the occasion of a persecution against the church. Jerome was himself a witness to the barbarous nations beginning to tear in pieces the Roman empire, and upon this occasion exclaims, ' He who hindered is taken out of the way, and we do not consider that Antichrist approaches, whom the Lord Jesus shall consume with the

spirit of his mouth.' St. Austin having cited this passage affirms that 'no one questions that the apostle spoke these things concerning Antichrist: and the day of judgment (for this he calleth the day of the Lord) should not come, unless Antichrist come first.—“ And now ye know what withholdeth.”—Some think this was spoken of the Roman empire; and therefore the apostle was not willing to write it openly, lest he should incur a præmunire, and be falsely accused of wishing ill to the Roman empire, which was hoped to be eternal. St. Chrysostome, in one of his homilies upon this passage, speaking of what hindered the revelation of Antichrist asserts that 'When the Roman empire shall be taken out of the way, then he shall come: and it is very likely: for as long as the dread of this empire shall remain, no one shall quickly be substituted; but when this shall be dissolved, he shall seize on the vacant empire, and shall endeavour to assume the power both of God and men.' And who hath seized on the vacant empire in Rome, and assumed the power both of God and man let the world judge.

In this manner these ancient and venerable fathers expound this passage; and in all probability they had learned by tradition from the apostle, or from the church of the Thessalonians, that what retarded the revelation of Antichrist was the Roman empire, but when the Roman empire should be broken into pieces, and be no longer able to withhold him, then he should appear in the Christian church, and domineer principally in the Church of Rome. Even in the opinion of a bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great, who sat in the chair at the end of the sixth century, whosoever affected the title of universal bishop, he was Antichrist, or the forerunner of Antichrist. 'I speak it confidently,' says he, 'that whosoever calleth himself uni-

versal bishop, or desireth so to be called, in the pride of his heart, he doth forerun Antichrist.' When John, then bishop of Constantinople first usurped this title, Gregory made answer, ' By this pride of his, what thing else is signified, but that the time of Antichrist is now at hand ?' Again, he says, upon the same occasion, ' The king of pride (that is Antichrist) approacheth ; and what is wicked to be spoken, an army of priests is prepared.' When the papal doctrines and the papal authority prevailed over all, it was natural to think and expect, that the true notion of Antichrist would be stifled, and that the doctors of the church would endeavour to give another turn and interpretation to this passage. That night of ignorance was so thick and dark, that there was hardly here and there a single star to be seen in the whole hemisphere. But no sooner was there any glimmering or dawning of a reformation, than the true notion of Antichrist, which had been so long suppressed, broke out again. As early as the year 1120, a treatise was published concerning Antichrist, wherein the faithful are admonished that ' the great Antichrist was long ago come ; in vain was he still expected, he was now, by the permission of God, advanced in years,' and the author having described the corrupt state of the church at that time, says afterwards, ' This state of men (not a single man) is Antichrist, the whore of Babylon, the fourth beast of Daniel, (to wit, in his last state, as it is said) that man of sin and son of perdition, who is exalted above every God, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, that is, the church, shewing himself that he is God ; who is now come with all kind of seduction, and lies in those who perish.' The Waldenses and Albigenses propagated the same opinions in the same century. That the pope was Antichrist was indeed the

general doctrine of the first reformers everywhere. Here in England it was advanced by Wickliff, and was learnedly established by that great and able champion of the Reformation, Bishop Jewel, in his *Apolo-
gy and Defence*, and more largely in his *Exposition upon the two Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*. This doctrine contributed not a little to promote the Reformation, and wheresoever the one prevailed the other prevailed also.

Such doctrine as this must necessarily give great offence to the bigots and devotees of the church of Rome : and no wonder therefore that in the last Lateran Council, the pope gave strait commandment to all preachers, that no man should presume once to speak of the coming of Antichrist. The king of France also with the advice of his council interdicted that any one should call the pope antichrist : and Grotius, who was ambassador in France from the crown of Sweden, in a vain hope and expectation of reconciling the disputes and differences between papists and protestants, composed his treatise concerning Antichrist, not wickedly but weakly ; with an honest intention, it may be presumed, but it is certain with pernicious effect ; more like an advocate for one party, than a moderator between both. At the same time in England, though James the First had written a treatise to prove the pope Antichrist, yet this doctrine was growing unfashionable during his reign, and more so in that of his son, who married a bigoted popish princess ; even while Mr. Mede was living, who had exerted more learning and sagacity in explaining the prophecies and in fixing the true idea of Antichrist, than perhaps any writer in any age. But probably for this very reason he was looked upon with an evil eye, and (to the disgrace of the times) obtained no preferment, though he

was eminently deserving of the best and greatest. He says himself in one of his letters (Epist. 56.) that his notions about genuflexion towards the altar 'would have made another man a dean, or a prebend, or something else ere this: but the point of the pope's being Antichrist, as a dead fly, marred the savour of that ointment.' The abuse also that some fanatics made of this doctrine greatly prejudiced the world against it. It was esteemed a mark of a puritan, and was a certain obstacle to preferment, for any man to preach that the pope was Antichrist: and Dr. Montagu, a famous court-chaplain at that time, who endeavoured to prove that the power of the king was absolute, endeavoured also to prove that the notes and characters of Antichrist belonged to the Turk rather than to the pope: and herein he was followed by several divines, and by no less a man than Bishop Fell, if he was the compiler or approver (as he is commonly said to have been) of the Paraphrase and Annotations upon all St. Paul's Epistles. There are fashions in divinity as well as in every thing else; and therefore the true doctrine of Antichrist was for some time suspended, and false hypotheses were invented; and it may surprise any one, that so little was said upon this subject in the long controversies concerning popery during the reigns of Charles and James the Second. It is hoped that the truth is now emerging again. Some laudable attempts have lately been made to revive and restore it: and if I have not proved that this interpretation is preferable to all others, I have taken pains and proved nothing.

But it hath been proved, as I conceive, that this is the general sense and meaning of the apostle, that this only is entirely consistent with the context, that every other interpretation is forced and unnatural, that this is

liable to no material objection, that it coincides perfectly with Daniel, that it is agreeable to the tradition of the primitive church, and that it hath been exactly fulfilled in all particulars, which cannot be said of any other interpretation whatsoever. Such a prophecy as this is at once an illustrious proof of divine revelation, and an excellent antidote to the poison of popery. It is like a two-edged sword that will cut both ways, and wound the deist with one side, and the papist with the other. The papists are in some respects like the Jews. As the Jews believe not that Christ is come according to the prophecies, but still live in expectation of him ; so neither do the papists perceive that Antichrist is come according to the prophecies, but still maintain that he shall arise hereafter. The apostle not only foretells this blindness and infatuation, but likewise assigns the reason, “ because they received not the love of the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” But to the protestants, who believe and profess that both the Christ and Antichrist are come, we may say with the apostle (ver. 13, 14.) “ We are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth : whereunto he called you by the gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.” The apostle proceeds (ver. 15.)—“ Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle : ” and certainly there is not any oral tradition that hath a juster claim to be thought apostolical, than this of the *man of sin's* succeeding upon the decline of the Roman empire, and exalting himself over all. Wherefore to conclude, as the apostle concludes the subject (ver. 16, 17.) “ Now our Lord Jesus Christ

himself, and God even our Father, who hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope, through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work,"—*Bishop Newton on the Prophecies. Dobson's Edition, p. 409, 416.*

(77.)—2 Thess. ii. 4.—“ Which is an adversary, and exalteth himself against all that is called GOD, or that is worshipped, so that he doth sit in the temple of GOD, showing himself that he is GOD.” Thus the Apostle speaketh of Antichrist: he is the man of sin, and the son of perdition. It will be somewhat hard to treat of this matter, and to open the words of this Scripture. Whatsoever I shall speak it will be ill taken of many, and many will doubt the truth of my speech; such affection they bear to him, whom the Apostle deciphers to be Antichrist. Albeit whatsoever I utter in opening the Apostle's words shall be such, as the Holy Scriptures and learned writings of the holy fathers have left unto us, and the Church of God hath proved, and at this day doth prove to be true. . . .

Now as the coming of Christ was, such is the coming of Antichrist. God hath foretold of his coming. Daniel hath foretold, Christ and his Apostles, Paul and John have foretold it. The Scriptures and old fathers make often mention hereof. There is none either old or young, either learned or unlearned, but hath heard of Antichrist; they hate his name, and detest him before they know him.

But here you may mark the wonderful sleight and subtlety of Satan; the world shall look after the coming of Antichrist; he shall not fail but come; all men shall carry hatred against him, and reckon him

abominable, and yet their eyes shall be blinded, and their hearts deceived, so that they shall not know him : they shall hate his name, and embrace his doctrine ; he shall cover himself with a cloak of holiness : they shall think they do good service unto Christ, but shall therein do service unto Antichrist.

The divers fantasies of men, have devised many fond tales of the person of Antichrist. . . . These tales have been craftily devised to beguile our eyes, that whilst we look upon these guesses, and so occupy ourselves in beholding a shadow, or probable conjecture of Antichrist, he which is Antichrist indeed may unawares deceive us.

But what shall he do whereby he may be known : Paul saith, “ Which is an adversary. This shall be the mark whereby you may know him ; he shall set himself against God, and against Christ, for he is an enemy of the cross of Christ.” Why then, say you, are not the Jews, and Mahomet, and the Turk, either all, or the most wicked of them, so called, seeing they utterly refuse all Christian religion ? Because none of these sit in the temple of God, which is the place where Antichrist shall advance himself ; and because Antichrist shall not in open show set himself against Christ, as doth Mahomet, and the Turk, but subtly and craftily, like an evil and ungracious servant. He will not openly speak his blasphemies, or spit at the gospel of God, or defy the name of Christ ; but he will call himself ‘ the servant of God ; ’ perhaps ‘ the vicar of Christ ; ’ and perhaps ‘ the servant of God’s servants ; ’ or perhaps, ‘ the head, or the chief member of the church.’ He shall say, he is led with the zeal of God’s house, and shall do nothing less ; for he shall seek himself ; he shall say he seeks the glory of God, when all that he doth, is for the enriching, and

ambitious enlarging of his own worldly pomp, and vanity.

In matters of princes, if any man take upon him the name of an ambassador, or deputy to a prince, having no commission thereto, and in this boldness, presume to levy and raise a power, and force the subjects to follow him, although he work all this under the name, and by the colour of the prince's authority, as in the manner of rebels to do, yet he is a traitor, and his doings are not well thought of, because he deals in the prince's matters, without warrant from the prince.

Even so Antichrist ; he shall come in the name of Christ, yet will do all things against Christ, and under pretence and colour of serving Christ ; he shall devour the sheep and people of Christ ; he shall deface whatsoever Christ hath taught ; he shall quench that fire which Christ hath kindled ; those plants which Christ hath planted, he shall root up ; he shall undermine that house which Christ hath built ; he shall be contrary to Christ ; his faith contrary to the faith of Christ, and his life contrary to the life of Christ. Is any man desirous to know Antichrist ? His coming shall be notable ; it shall astonish the world. By this mark you may know him ; he shall be contrary to Christ. To show you at large this contrariety, by comparison of things contrary in Christ and Antichrist would ask long time. It shall be sufficient that we consider only some few wherein they are manifestly contrary, that by them, judgment may be made of the residue.

St. Paul saith, Heb. x.—“ With one offering hath he consecrated for ever them that are sanctified.” And again : “ We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once made.” What is he then

that saith, 'I make priests to offer a daily sacrifice for the sins of the people, by whom the offering up of the body of Christ is made every day?' He is contrary to Christ, he is Antichrist.

St. Paul saith, Eph. i.—“ God hath appointed Christ over all things, to be the Head of the Church,” What is he then that saith, I am the head of the Church? Which saith, All the Churches of God are knit in me; you must understand as I understand; you must hear with mine ears, and see with mine eyes; I will govern and direct you? He is contrary to Christ; this is Antichrist.

Christ ordained that the communion should be ministered under both kinds, Matt. xxvi. What is he then that delivers it to the people but under one kind? He is contrary to Christ: he breaks the first institution of the Lord's Supper; he is Antichrist.

“ Christ saith,” (John xviii.) “ My kingdom is not of this world.” What is he then, which saith, I am lord of lords, and king of kings: I have right to both swords; my power and authority reacheth over all the kingdoms of the world? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ washed his disciples' feet, John xiii. What is he then that gives his feet to be kissed of kings and emperors? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ paid tribute to Cæsar, Matt. xvii. What is he then that exempts himself and his clergy from the temporal sword and authority? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist.

Christ allowed marriage, and reprov'd fornication. What is he then that allows fornication, and forbids marriage? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ saith, John v., “ Search the scriptures.” What is he then that saith, “ Give not that which is

holy unto dogs, neither cast pearls before swine ;” ye may not search the scripture ? He is contrary to Christ ; he is Antichrist. These are the certain and undoubted marks of Antichrist.

“ So that he doth sit in the temple of God.” That is, he is bold, and without force or constraint of any danger : he is not driven to hide himself in a corner ; he is exalted in the eye and in the heart of the world. He bears rule in the conscience of men. He has the keys to open and shut at his pleasure. He makes kings and princes become his subjects ; he rules them not by sword or spear only, but by pretence of religion ; he tells them all things are put in subjection under his feet ; that he is the vicar of Christ ; that his word must be taken as the word of God. So, he sitteth in the temple of God, as if he were God.

The godly preachers sit also in the temple of God ; they are the ministers of Christ, and disposers of the secrets of God. There they expound the scriptures, and show the good and acceptable will of God. There they exhort, and teach, and reprove, and correct, and instruct the people in righteousness. Antichrist sits not in the Church after this sort : he teaches not, nor exhorts the people. He makes that no part of his office. How sits he then ? What shall he say ? What shall he do ?

The apostle tells us : “ He exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshipped.” He shall be honoured with the honour that is due unto God ; he shall shine and glitter in gold and precious stones ; he shall be carried upon the shoulders of men ; and waited upon by kings and princes, and great estates ; so shall he be contrary to Christ.

Christ was humble and lowly. The prophet in his own person speaks of him, Psalm xxii. “ I am a worm

and not a man; a shame of men, and the contempt of the people." And the apostle saith, Phil. ii. "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Behold his parents, his birth, his cradle; behold his life, his disciples, his doctrine, his death; all were witnesses unto his humility. He saith of himself, Matt. viii. The Son of Man, hath not whereon to rest his head;" and to his disciples he saith, Luke xxii. "The kings of the gentiles reign over them, and they that bear rule over them are called gracious Lords; but you shall not be so." And again, Matt. xi. "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls."

Now on the other part, take view of Antichrist; behold his birth, his place, his chair, his estate, his doctrine, his disciples, and all his life; you shall see nothing but pomp and glory; Gregory calls him, the king of pride. He is proud in life, proud in doctrine, proud in word, proud in deeds: he is like Lucifer, and sets himself before his brethren, and over nations and kingdoms.

He makes every knee to bow down to him, and worship him; he makes kings to bring him water, to carry his train, to hold his cup, to bear his dish, to lead his bridle, and to hold his stirrup; he claims power over heaven and earth; he saith, he is lord over all the world, the lord of lords, and the king of kings; that his authority reaches up into heaven, and down into hell; that he can command the angels of God, that he condemns whom he will condemn; that he makes saints at his pleasure; that whatsoever he blesses, is blessed; and that whatsoever he curses, is cursed.

He sells merits, the forgiveness of sins, the sacrifice for the quick and the dead: he makes merchandise of the souls of men; he lays his filthy hands upon the

Lord's anointed ; he removes kings, and deposes the states and princes of the world ; this is Antichrist ; this is his power. Thus shall he work, and make himself manifest. So shall he sit in the temple of God. The people shall wonder at him, and shall have him in reverence ; they shall say, who is like unto the beast ? Who is so wise, so mighty, so godly, so virtuous, so holy, so like unto God ? So intolerable and monstrous shall be his pride.

It were much for him to sit in the seat, and to occupy the room of an earthly king or emperor ; but he shall take upon him the authority, and the name of God ; the name of the living Lord ; the name of God, which hath made heaven and earth ; even the name of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ ! And in this pride, he shall exceed all others that have been wicked. The pharisees and the scribes were wicked, yet none of them did sit in the temple of God, shewing himself that he was God. Arius, Nestorius, Montanus, Valentinus, were wicked heretics ; yet they never took upon them the name of God.

What should I say of this blasphemy ? Or in whom may we find the like ? Mahomet was a Turk, and a false prophet, and a deceiver of the people ; yet he took not upon him the name of God. This point and reach of ungodliness belongeth only to Antichrist : he shall sit in the place of God in judgments ; he shall show himself out of that place, as if he were God. Irenæus saith, Whereas he is but a servant, he will be worshipped as if he were God.

But some will say, Antichrist shall be mortal as other men, born of a mortal father and mother ; he shall know that he shall die, and that he is but dust, and shall return again unto dust ; that he cannot make himself : No, that he cannot make the least and vilest

of all creatures. How then will he proclaim himself to be an immortal God? how will he call himself God, that made heaven and earth? or God which had no beginning, nor shall have any end? No; this is not the meaning of these words. He shall not so think of himself, nor so say.—I will tell you after what sort, he shall sit in the temple of God, and how the world shall receive him, and reverence him as God.

He shall take to himself that supreme authority and prerogative, which appertaineth only to God by nature. Although he be but a man, yet in office he will be accounted as God. He shall compare his laws with the laws of God; he shall say, his word is the word of God. Whatsoever he saith, he shall say, it is the voice of the spirit of God, of the same authority, that is, the gospel of Christ. No man may break it, no man may touch the credit thereof; if any man withstand it, he must think he doth sacrilege, committeth blasphemy, and sinneth against the Holy Ghost. Again; he shall break the laws of God to uphold his own, and shall pull down God, to set up himself.

Such shall be the power and authority of Antichrist; so shall he possess the consciences of the people; so shall he sit as an idol in their hearts; so shall he stand in the place of God, and show himself that he is God. The people shall receive his doctrine and believe his word; they shall fall down before him, and worship him; they shall say, "Who is like unto the beast? Rev. xiii. What creature is so beautiful as he? They shall honour him as God.

In the Extravagants* it is set down, "Our Lord God the pope." Mark these words; Our Lord God the pope. In them the pope is called Lord, and is

* The extravagants were decretals of the Popes, added by them to the Canon law.

called God. Oh! Merciful Lord God, who from the heavens beholdest this vanity, how great is thy mercy in suffering this!

I devise not this; his own books, his own doctors, his own decrees and decretals, speak it, and set it down. 'To believe that our Lord God the pope, might not decree, as he hath decreed, it were a matter of heresy;' it is so written there, he has heard it, he has seen it, he knows it is so, yet he suffers it to go abroad, and thereby suffers himself to be called God. He has burnt many saints of God, and holy men, for no other cause, but for the profession of the gospel. He has in many places burnt the Holy Bible, and such books as teach nothing but godliness. . . .

But you say, the pope at this day is not called God; he rather abases himself, and writes himself by a title of humility, and is called, The servant of servants. Be it so, that he is so called, and so written. Yet he is king of kings, and lord of lords. This servant saith, I do make holy the unholy; I do justify the wicked; I do forgive sins, I open and no man shutteth.—This servant can say, Whosoever obeyeth not me, he shall be rooted out.—This servant may dispense with any commandment of the old and new Testament.—'This servant has Christ's lieutenantship, not only over things in heaven, over things in earth, and over things in hell, but also over the angels, both good and bad.' No man may judge this servant; for they say, 'The pope is exempted from all law of man.' And again; 'Neither all the clergy, nor all the whole world, may either judge, or depose the pope.' Such a power this servant of servants claims to himself. What greater power can be given to God? What angel, what archangel, ever had the like power?

And this power, even at this day, pope Pius chal-

length as proper to his seat ; that he has the authority that is due to Christ over his church ; that no man may judge him, nor say he doth err, nor ask why he doth so. He is invested in the privilege of his church, and loses no one jot of his dignity. It is yet good at this day, which hath been set down, ‘ It is sin, as great as sacrilege, or church-robbing, to reason of any of the pope’s doings.’ These are their own words, God knows, before whom we stand this day, they are their own words, and not mine. Thus does he sit in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.

And therefore we may say, as Eusebius said, ‘ This is an evident token that they hate God, because they will have themselves called by the name of God ; ’ or as Gregory, who speaking of Antichrist said, ‘ Whereas he is a cursed man, and not a spirit ; he feigns himself, by lying to be a God.’ . . .

Antichrist shall appear, not when he will, but he shall be revealed in his time. His time is the time of darkness, when shepherds, and the guides of the people shall be careless ; when the word shall be loathed ; when the *light* shall be put out, when superstition shall reign ; when ignorance shall have the upper hand ; when the creature shall not be known from the Creator ; when there shall be no fear of God, no regard of godliness ; when the people shall not know wherefore they pray, nor whom they worship, nor in whom they believe ; then shall it appear that Antichrist is come, then shall he shew himself ; this is his time.

The mystery of iniquity doth already work. Let us not be deceived. Antichrist shall certainly come, and shall draw many into error. As it was with Christ at his coming ; he was in the world, he did the works of his Father, yet few knew him ; so shall it be

with Antichrist ; he shall be in the world, he shall work his iniquity, and few shall know him. . . .

We may not think that Antichrist shall come as a robber by the highways, or like a murderer, or like a tyrant, that burns our houses, or sacks our cities, or destroys our fields, or pulls down all that is before him ; we may not look that he should say, I am Antichrist, I am that man of sin, I am the son of perdition, I am the adversary, and I am contrary to Christ. He shall not show forth himself in any such a sort ; he shall not so speak of himself ; he is subtle and cunning ; he shall deceive the learned and the wise ; he shall cast himself into a colour of holiness, he shall fast, he shall pray, he shall give alms, and show mercy ; he shall walk as if he were a disciple of Christ ; he shall counterfeit an angel of light ; he shall go before, and the world shall follow him ; so shall the mystery of iniquity work ; his life, his religion, his doctrine, shall be close, and hid, and secret. . . .

He shall walk in craftiness, and handle the word of God deceitfully ; he shall mingle his lies with the truth of God ; he shall mingle his poison with the wholesome food of our souls, so closely, and subtly, that it shall hardly be espied : he shall go forward by little and little, and so win credit, and convey himself into the hearts of the people. This is a mystery . . .

But who are they that shall follow his lore ? Who yield themselves to him, and who shall be deceived ? Are they poor men, or artificers, or labourers ? Or are they unlearned and ignorant men ? No, no ; he shall deceive priests, bishops, archbishops, princes, kings, emperors, the gravest, the most learned, the wisest, the mightiest men in the world. He shall

blind their eyes, and amaze their hearts ; they shall run to him out of all parts of the earth ; they shall fall down before him ; they shall ask counsel of him ; they shall say, Thou art the doctor of doctors, thou art the father of fathers, thou art the comfort of the church, thou art the light of the world, thou art most holy ; all law, and all knowledge is hid in thy breast ; we beseech thy holiness show us thy way, expound thou the law unto us, teach us how we may be saved ; thou hast the key of knowledge, thy word is the word of truth. So shall they creep to Antichrist, so shall they pour out their souls before him, so shall they seek counsel at his mouth, so shall they fetch light at the prince of darkness.

“ This mystery,” saith St. Paul, “ doth already work ; it shall increase and go forward, and grow to perfection.” A thorn when it is young, is soft and gentle ; you may thrust at it with your finger, it will not hurt you ; but after it waxes and grows hard and stubborn, it will pierce the flesh, and draw blood. A bear when he is young, is harmless and innocent ; you may dandle it and play with it as with a whelp ; it hath no chambers to gripe, no teeth to bite, nor paws to tear ; but afterwards it will grow, and become fierce and cruel like the sire. A serpent when it is young, is little and pretty ; it has no sting nor poison ; you may take it in your hand, and lay it on your lap, it will not hurt you ; afterwards it will increase in venom, and grow in mischief, and be like itself ; then it will shake the sting, and cast poison, and prove dangerous.

Such a thorn, such a bear, such a serpent is Antichrist. At the first he shall seem soft, and gentle, and pretty, and innocent : after that he shall grow fierce, and arm himself with sting and poison. But a

thorn, though it be soft, is a thorn ; a bear, though he be little, is a bear ; a serpent, though he be pretty, is a serpent. Even so Antichrist. Though he seem gentle, mild, and simple, yet is he Antichrist. He grows by degrees ; he will be like his sire ; his paws will be dreadful ; his mouth will be deadly. He will shake the earth like an earthquake. Such shall be the mystery and coming of Antichrist. He shall show forth himself at the first with countenance of devotion and holiness, that he may closely, and privily, and secretly wreath in himself. Few shall be able to understand the mystery of his dealing, after he shall be opened, and appear as he is.

Who would think there were any evil in enforcing of virginity, chastity, or single life ? He that is unmarried careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord, that he may be holy, both in body, and also in spirit. Would to God it were so with all who have taken the profession of single life,—but the colour is fair. Hence has it grown that bishops and priests, and young men and maidens have continued single. This seemed strange, and a miracle, and a matter of great holiness.

But this is a mystery ; this is a way to bring in Antichrist. Mark what St. Paul speaks hereof, 1 Tim. iv. “ They shall forbid to marry.” Of whom speaks he ? of Antichrist and his disciples ; they shall forbid lawful marriage as unholy, and as a state of life unfit for their holiness. Yet Christ Jesus, the Son of God, never forbade it ; his apostles were married, and had wives.

“ This,” saith St. Paul, “ is a mark of Antichrist, by this shall he be known.” Forbidding to marry is a doctrine of devils ; not of Christ, nor of God, but of devils. It is a gulf, it is a sea, it is a world, it is a

hell of iniquity, and the vilest villany, that ever crept into the church of God. Jerome, expounding the words of Daniel, chap. xi. "He shall have no regard to the desire of women," saith, 'The better exposition hereof is to apply these words to Antichrist, for that he shall pretend chastity, that he may deceive many. This is the mystery of iniquity. This is the practice of Antichrist: he shall come with a cloak of counterfeit chastity, and so shall deceive the hearts of many.' . . .

Who would think there were any evil of godly prayers of the Church? . . . These prayers shall Antichrist take to work his iniquity, and under pretence of them shall devour widows' houses, and shall make a net of them, to fish and drag for all the riches of the world.—This is also the mystery of iniquity.

Who would think there were so great evil in the doctrine of purgatory. . . .

Brethren this is the mystery of all mysteries, and the secret of all secrets. In this stands the countenance, and all the welfare of Antichrist.

He has impropried (converted to his own use) the whole kingdom of purgatory to himself, and has made it more gainful than heaven and earth. There he sells prayers, there he makes port sail of bulls and pardons; there he sells forgiveness of sins, from the punishment and from the blame. He sells the mercies of God, the blood of the martyrs, the works of supererogation, the merits of his fratries, the blood of Christ; there he sells paradise, deliverance or assurance from hell, and entrance into heaven; he makes merchandise of the souls of the people; this is the alone mystery, above all other mysteries.

Who would think there were an evil in the name of the Church? it is the witness-bearer unto the Gospel:

it is the pillar of truth, it is the spouse of Christ. Yet saith Christ, Antichrist shall come in my name; he shall seem holy; he shall talk of the Gospel; he shall carry the face of the church, and deceive many. This is a mystery.

Who would think it a matter of so great inconvenience, for a man to call the Bishop of Rome, the greatest bishop, or the chiefest patriarch, and the highest judge, and to say that all appeals lie unto him? What hurt may this be? it seems a small matter, a matter of nothing. But it is a practice, it is a secret, it is a mystery; hence flowed all the streams of vanity and presumption wherein he advances himself; hence it is that he saith, "I am above kings and emperors; I am above general councils; I am above the whole Church of Christ; I am above the angels of God; I have power to command, and to countermand them at my pleasure; I am the successor of Peter, I am the vicar of Christ. No man may judge me, whatsoever I do; I cannot err; general Councils might err; the Apostles might err; the Angels of God might err; but I cannot err. I have the fulness of power; the whole world is my diocese; whosoever is saved, is under me; whosoever is not under me, is cursed of God. I am the light of the world, I can in a manner do whatsoever God can do."

All these speeches are written, are printed, are published, and proclaimed abroad. This is a mystery of iniquity, this is a deep secret. These are the very ways and steps of Antichrist: God give us eyes to see them, and hearts that we may discern them.

Paul saw this mystery working even at the time he lived. John saith, 3 John, "Diotrephes loveth to have the pre-eminence; to lift up himself above his

brethren, be the head of the church, and to bear a mastery." So Paul espied contentions in Corinth, 1 Cor. ii.—"Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I am of Apollos, and I am of Cephas, and I am of Christ:" These were the beginning of Antichrist. But Paul saith, 2 Cor. iv.—"We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." So the true disciples of Christ reckon not themselves any thing, but the members one of another, but the ministers by whom the people believe, but witnesses chosen before of God, but such as are commanded to preach, but God's labourers. — *Bp. Jewell, on the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians.*

(78.)—St. Paul saith, 2 Cor. x.—"We do not war after the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare are mighty, through God, to cast down holds." This sword hath hewn down in many places, the cruelty, tyranny, simony, insatiable greediness, the errors, ignorance, darkness, vanities, hypocrisy, superstition, and idolatry, which have been brought into the church, and used by *Antichrist*. These were the pillars, and strength, and glory of his kingdom.

And here mark the Apostle's speech; he saith not God shall convert Antichrist, or change his heart, that he may be saved; but he saith, *Whom the Lord shall consume. . . .* Such is the hardness and blindness of his heart, he will not receive the love of the truth, he will not believe the truth, that he might be saved; therefore destruction shall come upon him.

Hereby we are taught what to think or hope of reformation of the abuses and errors of the Church of Rome. They have been advertised of them, not only

by the professors of the gospel, but also many of themselves have spoken for reformation of sundry abuses ; they have kept many councils and assemblies ; they have promised redress ; they have sat in consultation many years. What one thing have they reformed ? See and look over their acts and sessions ; they are abroad in print. Hitherto they have reformed nothing ; no, not their pardons ; no, not their stews ; they have hardened their hearts, and set themselves against the Highest. Therefore shall the glory of the Lord show itself in their destruction ; with the breath of his lips they shall be consumed, and brought to nothing.

. . . Let us imagine a battle of two mighty princes, both of great power, and of great courage ; they meet together in the field ; they join in battle ; both sides encounter together ; either part is bent to beat down the other. . . .

Now let us by this make some resemblance of the battle between Christ and Antichrist ; between Christ the Son of God, and Antichrist the son of the devil ; either of them is well prepared ; they are both mighty, and have both of them soldiers and knights to attend upon them. Antichrist shall come from the earth, for all his glory is upon the earth ; his power shall be the power of Satan. Christ shall come from the heaven above, even from the bosom of his Father. . . . The ensign of Christ shall be everlasting truth ; the ensign of Antichrist shall be falsehood, and vanity, and all deceitfulness. By these marks shall either be known. . . . Antichrist shall desire to maintain his own traditions. Christ shall maintain the holy word of God ; Christ shall procure the glory of his Father ; Antichrist shall maintain his own glory. . . . We have heard briefly of Christ and Antichrist, their states . . .

what armour they shall bear, by what title they shall claim, what they shall seek, and where the fight shall be; that it shall be made in the consciences of the people. There shall Antichrist sit, there shall he be worshipped as God, there they shall call him the holy and most holy father; there shall be given to him the power of heaven and earth; there he himself shall rouse himself, and be settled and shall say, I sit as a prince, I shall never be removed, I cannot fall. But Christ shall blow him down *with the breath of his mouth, and shall abolish him with the brightness of his coming.*

. . . Let us be glad and rejoice, and give glory to Him, for she is fallen, she is fallen, Babylon, that great city, there she lieth, the mother of filth and fornication; there lieth Antichrist, the man of sin, the son of perdition, which is an adversary, which hath sat in the temple of God, and exalted himself above all that is called God; that wicked and lawless man lieth there. . . I have told that he shall be a reverend father, and wear a mitre, and be a bishop, and a bishop of bishops; so saith Gregory, so Jerome, so Augustine and Bernard, and others. And cannot we tell *who* it is, that calls himself a universal bishop, the bishop of all churches? Do we not hear of such a one? Do we not know him? Whatsoever he be, wheresoever he dwell, what countenance soever he bear, he is Antichrist.

. . . Antichrist shall sit in Peter's chair, and Rome shall be the seat of his kingdom. . . . I told you he shall prevail by falsehood, and by feigned miracles; by bulls, by pardons, by purgatories, and by such other devices and shifts of Satan. I told you, he shall be contrary to Christ, in sacraments, in sacrifice, in prayers, in life, in doctrine, in religion, in the whole

form and order of the church. He shall shut that which Christ hath opened, he shall open that which Christ hath shut ; he shall curse that which Christ hath blessed, and bless that which Christ hath cursed. No man shall be accounted faithful, no man catholic, no man the son of the church, no man may be saved without him, such credit and countenance shall he bear.

I told you, he shall be confounded and beaten down by the force and power of God's mighty word. His word is omnipotent ; it shall disclose the works of darkness ; it shall hew down idolatry, superstition, and the whole kingdom of Antichrist, as our eyes do see this day. Blessed be God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, his mighty hand hath wrought these things ; he hath triumphed through the name of his Christ ; he will bless the things he hath begun ; he will overthrow the whole power of Antichrist by his presence, and by the glory of his coming. Then shall it appear who is the successor of Peter, who is the true vicar of Christ, and who is Antichrist.—*Bishop Jewell on 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.*

(79.)—If Popery were Christianity, I should rejoice in its propagation. If the priests of Rome were employed in showing men the way of salvation by free grace, through the righteousness of a crucified Saviour ;—if they were labouring to instruct and edify those who believe in him ;—if they were themselves examples of being dead to the things of this world, and alive to those of another ;—if they were in short, like the Apostles of Christ, whose successors they profess to be, I would contemplate no danger, but much benefit to society, from the increase of their

number. But every one acquainted with the subject knows, that the reverse of this is the case. Popery is not Christianity, but the counterfeit of it. It is *Antichrist*; that is, against Christianity. The priests of that religion are not employed in preaching salvation by free grace, but by the merit of men's own doings: they are not labouring to instruct the people, but to keep them in ignorance; and instead of being, like the Apostles, dead to this world, and alive to another, their greatest efforts are directed to the things of this world: how they may extort money from their deluded adherents, and how they may promote the reign of ignorance and *error*. The propagation of this religion, therefore, and the multiplication of its priests, are evils to be deprecated as much as the introduction of the plague into the country. They are the pests of human society; and wherever they shall obtain a footing, farewell to every social and domestic comfort.—*The Protestant*, * Vol. I. p. 77. Tenth Edition.

(80.)—The true religion has in all ages been opposed by error, idolatry, and superstition. The enmity of the seed of the serpent against the seed of the woman has not been suspended for a single day since the time of Cain and Abel; and he who was a liar from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, hath never ceased to oppose the truth, or to pervert it, or to conceal it by substituting something in its place, or by any

* The late Bishop Burgess in his *Three Catechisms*, 4th ed. p. ix., speaks in high terms of '*The Protestant*.' He calls it '*an admirable work*,' and says, '*The Author writes with ample knowledge of his subject, with great acuteness of reasoning, and with the force and perspicuity of William Law.*'

means to divert the minds of men from it, lest they should believe and be saved. This opposition to the truth has been carried on in various forms and under different names; but the general character of it has been substantially the same in all ages. It was reserved, however, for the last age of the world, or the New Testament dispensation, to exhibit it in a more systematic and organized form than it had been at any former period; and to effect its object more insidiously than before, by assuming the name of Christianity, and under that sacred name, to teach and practise all the idolatry and immorality of the ancient heathen.

This in the language of prophecy is emphatically called the Antichrist; and the impure character of the system is exhibited under the figure of a great harlot, corrupting the earth with her fornications. How applicable to the Church of Rome the description is I hope will appear to the reader's satisfaction from the general tenor of my work, in which it has been my endeavour to exhibit the genuine character of popery, for the purpose of warning my countrymen against it, and if possible of gaining some from under its deadly influence.

This great apostacy was the subject of very ancient prophecy. The Holy Spirit thus gave warning of the evil that was coming upon the world, that the true worshippers of God might be on their watch, and that those who were seduced by it might be without excuse. As early as the time of Daniel the prophet, we have the character of the system described, and even mention made of the period of its continuance; and I am not sure but there are obscure and parabolic allusions to it at a much earlier period.

The God of Israel graciously condescended to speak of the union between him and his church, under the

figure of the marriage relation. Thus he speaks by one of the prophets;—"I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, and the love of thine espousals," Jer. ii. 2. and by another;—"Thy Maker is thy husband; the Lord of Hosts is his name," Isa. liv. 5. The church maintained the fidelity of a chaste spouse, while she practised the worship of the true God according to the purity of his institution; but idolatry is, in numerous passages of the Old Testament, called "playing the harlot." Indeed, in hundreds of instances, the word adultery is used for idolatry; and when Israel showed the least leaning towards idol-worship, she was accused of forgetting the marriage-relation. The church then assumed the character of a strange woman, and there is one described by Solomon as the strange woman, which from the narrative, I think, cannot mean an individual, any more than the sinful man or "Man of sin" can mean any one person. It is a power or system,—a mystery of iniquity, always at work; but so organized in the Church of Rome as to be described under the character of one great meretricious personage, seducing and corrupting the world by her allurements.

. . . In my last number, I endeavoured to illustrate some of the prophecies of the Old Testament, which, I think, have reference to the grand apostasy from the worship of the true God; in which the apostate church is described under the figure of wickedness embodied and organized, and as the great harlot, seducing and ruining the souls of men. In the prophecies of Daniel we have the same system of wickedness predicted under the figure of a horn, which is an emblem of power and dominion.

. . . It is not my intention to write a dissertation on the prophecies . . . What I intend is to show in few

words, that the Holy Spirit warned the church in ancient times, that a monster should arise in the latter days, whose character corresponds in every particular with that of the Church of Rome. He is one who speaks great words against the Most High. The greatest words which a creature can speak against the Most High, are those which claim equality with him, or which claim to hold his place, and to exercise his authority. This has been done by the Church of Rome for twelve hundred years. I do not speak merely of the high titles assumed by the pope, such as 'His Holiness,'—which is his acknowledged title as much as 'His Majesty' is that of our sovereign; nor of 'Our Lord God the Pope,' as he is styled by his flattering courtiers; nor of 'The Prince of the Kings of the Earth,' as he affects to be, and agreeably to which he has disposed of kings and kingdoms. It is enough that this church sets up her authority as at least equal to that of God, if not superior to it, by lording it over the consciences of men, presuming to dictate what they shall believe, and actually setting aside the authority of the word of God, which she does every day by her traditions. The head of this church pretends to be God's vicar upon earth: that is to hold God's place, and to be instead of God to human creatures; and, considering what his personal character has generally been, no greater words against God can be spoken, than that this is his representative.

'He shall think to change times and laws;' and not only think, or imagine the thing, but actually do it. . . . There was never such a trafficking among the heathen as there is in the Church of Rome, in relation to the divine law. This is so changed by popery, that a man may live in the habitual flagrant violation of all its precepts; and though it says peremptorily,

“the soul that sinneth it shall die,” a popish priest professes to have the power of absolving the greatest transgressor, at the hour of death, and of giving him a sure passport to heaven. In short, the law of God, which is holy, just and good, is so changed in the Church of Rome as to be quite subverted; and to have a system of priestcraft and immorality put in its place. “They shall be given into his hand until a time, times, and the dividing of a time;” . . . which, according to prophetic language, means 1260 years. During this long period, it was predicted by Daniel, that this system of iniquity should be suffered to have power on the earth, to blaspheme the God of heaven, by speaking great words against him, to change or subvert his laws, and practise all manner of iniquity.

But the vision presents another feature of the character of the monster, which applies most decidedly to the Church of Rome :—“He shall wear out the saints of the Most High! There was never in the world, under any name, a power of whom this can be so truly said as of popery. From the time that the beast was established on his throne, no man within the sphere of his influence was permitted to believe and publish the genuine gospel of the grace of God, and to serve God as his saints in the time of the apostles did. The Christian doctrine having been corrupted, and divine institutions superseded by human inventions, if any man dared to profess the unadulterated gospel, and to worship God with New Testament simplicity, it was at the hazard of his life. Genuine Christianity was proscribed as heresy; and every potentate, and every private individual, whom the church could move by her promises or threats, was called to labour to the utmost of his power in the *pious*—the *meritorious* work of extirpating heresy; that is, to use the words of

Pope Innocent in his bull to that effect, ‘ to root out, and cause to perish the venomous adders,’ who presumed to believe and worship according as they were instructed by the word of God. By persevering in this course for ages, the Church of Rome succeeded in “wearing out” the saints; not absolutely, for God still had witnesses for the truth on the earth; but so worn out, and exterminated, that they were comparatively few for a long period. What a wasting and wearing out of the saints does this represent, during the long period of 1260 years! It has been said, that persecution tends to the increase of a persecuted sect, which may be true of moderate persecution, if there be such a thing: but not of such persevering, relentless, and savage persecution as that of the Church of Rome, especially where the Inquisition was established; for it is a fact, that in many places, particularly in Spain, this horrid engine of popish tyranny prevailed to the entire extirpation of what they called heresy. The saints of the Most High were quite worn out in these parts. No man could even think in his heart what was taught in the word of God; for his confessor would have brought it out of him, and have sent him to the rack and the fire if he did not recant.

In the crusade against the Waldenses, hundreds of thousands were murdered in cold blood, or died of cold and hunger upon the mountains; yet the light of the true religion was never altogether extinguished there, as it was in Spain by the Inquisition. The inhabitants of the mountains and valleys of Piedmont were exposed to the most cruel persecution, centuries before the Reformation, and it was continued with little interruption down to the middle of the 17th century.

. . . I have shown that the Antichrist was a sub-

ject of Old Testament prophecy; and that in the New Testament, he is pointed out in such characters as identify him with the Church of Rome. The centre of his power was to be that great city, which in the time of the Apostle John, reigned over the kings of the earth; and such was the state of the world at that time, that the words cannot be applied to any city but Rome.

But there are two passages in Paul's Epistles, in which the character of this monster of wickedness is portrayed with wonderful precision, 2 Thess. ii. 1—12; 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. In these two passages, the whole system is described, from the comparatively small abridgment of Christian liberty, by forbidding to eat flesh on certain days, up to the universal and tyrannical domination of one who puts himself in the place of God, claiming and exercising absolute authority over the bodies and souls of men; even exalting himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped, by presuming to alter what God has ordained, and to withhold or give the word of God at his pleasure. It is not necessary to ascribe all this to the pope in his single person: or to say that he alone is the Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition, or the Antichrist. It is the system of superstition, idolatry, and arbitrary domination over the consciences of men skilfully organized, and rigorously exercised by the church of which the pope is the acknowledged head.

Paul, in his preaching to the Thessalonians, had told them these things. They had mistaken something that he had said to them, or something that he had written in his first epistle about the last judgment, expecting that the end of the world was just at hand. Here he corrects their mistake, and assures them that a great apostasy should take place before the end of the world; and he informs them

further, that it was begun. It was not then revealed, or publicly manifested ; but it was working in secret, and would be revealed in due time, and appear in great power, when the obstruction was taken out of the way.

It was working among all the churches in Galatia where certain false teachers perverted the gospel, and taught the people to trust for salvation, partly at least, to their observance of rites and ceremonies. This was the same thing as to deny Christ altogether ; for if righteousness came in that way, Christ had died in vain. This is substantially the same error that pervades the whole system of popery ; which teaches to trust for salvation to the efficacy of sacraments, especially of the mass sacrifice ; and if this were really propitiatory, as the Church of Rome teaches, Christ must have died in vain, for his death was unnecessary, upon the supposition that any other sacrifice could serve the purpose of propitiation, or making an atonement for sin. The mystery of iniquity began also to work in the Church in Corinth, when the members were divided into parties, calling themselves by the names of mere men, though these men were apostles. One said, I am of Paul ; another, I am of Apollos ; and another, I am of Cephas. These were the orders of monks and nuns in embryo. They were the Augustinians and the Franciscans and Dominicans of the day. And yet what could be more harmless than the thing appeared at first ? It was only every one paying a compliment to his favourite preacher, and they were all inspired men to whom this was paid. Yes ; but the apostle says, it was because they were carnal : and it was from this apparently trifling error of the carnal mind, that the system of religious orders arose. It was not like calling different sects by their leaders, such as Luther and

Calvin, though I think there is Antichrist in that too ; but it was forming different religious orders in the same church, that was the fault of the Corinthians ; and for this the Church of Rome has been distinguished above all others.

It is not my intention to illustrate and apply the different parts of the above passages, because I have already touched on them all, in different parts of my work, particularly under the head of worshipping saints, which is meant by the doctrines of demons, that is, deifying departed spirits as the heathen did. (vol. I. p. 339.) Forbidding to marry, I have discussed under the head of clerical celibacy. (vol. III. p. 81—105.) Speaking lies in hypocrisy, has been exposed in every view which I have given of the character of popery ; as also the deceivableness of unrighteousness, and the lying wonders by which she imposes on the world.

There is one part of the description of which, indeed, I have said little or nothing ; that is, the manner and the means by which popery shall be destroyed and rooted out of the world. The apostle says of that wicked one, “ The Lord shall consume him with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of his coming.”

. . . I am aware that most people expect that Antichrist will be destroyed by means of dreadful temporal judgments, which are described as vials of wrath, poured out upon the seat of the beast. These are, pestilence, and famine and earthquakes, and desolating wars, by means of which nations which give their power to the beast,—which have been corrupted and seduced by her,—shall be depopulated and almost exterminated. All this may happen, and I suppose, something like this will take place, when the judgment of the great whore is to be executed ; but all

this would not destroy the Man of Sin ; it would in fact make no impression upon him, but to make him more sinful by blaspheming God on account of these plagues. Millions of supporters of the beast may perish by these judgments, but the beast himself cannot be killed by any material weapon ; for his soul is as immaterial as the soul of man. When the judgment takes place, his body shall be cast into the burning flame, that is, his material form, as existing and organized in different nations, shall be destroyed. But nothing can destroy the subtle intellectual enmity against God, in which his soul consists, but the spirit of God's mouth, and the brightness of his coming ; that is, the gospel of the grace of God, by which he subdues his enemies and converts them to himself. Where Antichrist is not destroyed in this way, he is not destroyed at all ; for he reigns with full power in the hearts of all who live and die in their sins ; and though he cannot properly be said to reign after the judgment is executed upon him, he will continue to exist in the regions of despair, with the full malignity of his heart against God, for ever and ever.—*The Protestant*, Vol. 4. p. 393—413.

(81.)—The opinions of many of the most eminent and learned commentators have differed very widely in explaining the Apocalypse. In regard to the *Antichristian power*, in particular, while some have considered it as referring exclusively to popery, others have concluded that Mahometanism and infidelity, together with popery, are designed by it. The extraordinary events which have occurred in the last thirty years, and the prevalence of irreligion, have been thought by some to confirm the general notion, that in-

fidelity is one branch of the Antichristian power. In consideration, however, of the number of wild and perhaps mischievous theories concerning the times and persons to which this opinion has usually led, it has been thought advisable to restrict the notes for this work to the long established opinion, that *Papal Rome* is intended by the *Antichristian power*.—*Mant and D'Oyly's Bible—Introduction to Revelation.*

(82.)—There is one thing which I desire not to lose sight of, and which I wish my readers always to keep in remembrance ; it is, that the foundation of the controversy lies deeper than any thing that meets the eye in the external fooleries and superstitions of the Church of Rome. The grand fundamental question at issue is no less than, Who is the Saviour of sinners? I call the Church of Rome the Antichrist, because she is opposed to Christ on this fundamental point. There is no truth more clearly revealed in the word of God, than that Christ alone is the Saviour ; that our salvation is entirely of him, without the assistance or co-operation of any creature whatever ; that our justification before God proceeds entirely upon the ground of his merit, or, what is a more expressive word, his righteousness, to the absolute exclusion of all merit or righteousness whatever on the part of creatures. This is so distinctly laid down in the holy scriptures, especially in St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians ; that I hold it as a first principle of divine revelation, that Christ is to a sinner, a whole Saviour, or he is not his Saviour at all ; that if we do not trust in him alone for salvation, we do not trust in him at all ; and that if a sinner put the smallest degree of trust in any thing else, be it what it may, though he

should still profess to put greater trust in Christ, he is in fact completely turned away from Christ, and he is making a Saviour of that something else in which he places his little trust.

Now papists openly and avowedly trust, at least in part, in their own merit and the merit of saints ; and though they profess also to trust in Christ, or perhaps to put greater trust in him, yet they do most effectually renounce him, by dividing their confidence between him, and themselves, and other creatures. What papists consider their own merit, consists in some fancied conformity to the whole, or to some part of the divine law. Now the apostle tells us plainly, " that if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain," Gal. ii. 21. a most horrible supposition ; but it is realized in the mind of every man who expects to contribute in the smallest degree to his own salvation, by his obedience to the law, that is, by his fancied righteousness ; and the same apostle tells us, Gal. v. 4. " that whosoever is justified by the law, he is fallen from grace. The very attempt to seek justification in this way, is to renounce Jesus Christ as the Saviour, and to make a saviour of their own merit ; and hence it is that I maintain that my controversy with the papists involves no less than this fundamental question,—Who is the saviour of sinners ?

I do not intend to enter at present upon a discussion of this subject, but I allude to it, in order to remind my readers of what I consider the root and origin of all the errors of Popery. It is the self-righteous bias of the human heart, and its deep-rooted hatred of the grace of the gospel. From this proceeds all the idolatry which I have been describing, and intend yet farther to describe ; for creature confidence leads us naturally to creature worship, as confidence in God leads

to worship him : and though we could persuade papists to give up transubstantiation, and all their mummary and nonsense, they would stand upon no better footing with regard to a future life, unless they gave up also their fundamental doctrine of human merit,* and were led to trust in that of Christ alone for the salvation of their souls.

It was the glory of the Reformation and of the Reformers, that notwithstanding their imperfections and mistakes on some points of order and discipline, they clearly apprehended, and publicly taught, the doctrine of justification, by faith alone, upon the footing of Christ's perfect righteousness ; that is, that men are justified and saved not by what they have done, or can do, but by what Christ has done and suffered in their stead ; and that they become interested in this by faith ; that is, by believing in the testimony of God in the Scriptures concerning his Son. On this point Luther, and Calvin, and other leaders of the Reformation, were entirely of one mind, though they differed on some subordinate articles ; and the German Reformer had such a deep conviction of the fundamental importance of this truth, that he called it the article, by holding or rejecting which, a church would stand or fall. It was sometime before Luther could

* The following Epitaph is inscribed upon a monument in one of their chapels, in the city of Cork : " I. H. S. Sacred to the memory of the benevolent Edward Molloy, the friend of humanity, and father of the poor ; he employed the wealth of this world only to secure the riches of the next ; and leaving a balance of merit on the book of life, he made heaven debtor to mercy. He died 17th Oct. 1818, aged 90, R. J. P. " *Philanthropic Gazette*, June, 16, 1819. This is the popery of the 19th century. The Editor justly condemns the daring impiety of making the Creator debtor to his creature ; but this is inseparable from the doctrine of human merit.

reconcile the doctrine so clearly taught by Paul, with that of James in his Epistle, which led him to doubt the divine inspiration of the latter ; but as his mind opened to the understanding of divine truth, he perceived, what every Christian peasant now perceives, that the doctrine of the one Apostle is perfectly consistent with that of the other.

But the Scripture doctrine respecting justification, or, which is the same thing, the way by which alone a sinner can be saved, is absolutely unintelligible to our papists. They will rather go without salvation than accept of it in the way of divine appointment. Like the Jews in the days of the Apostles, they will not submit to the righteousness of God ; that is, they will not receive salvation as a free gift through the righteousness of Christ ; and their masses, their pilgrimages, their penances, are nothing else than a going about to establish their own righteousness, as the Jews did by their ceremonial observances.

Now it is a great mistake to speak of this as if it were merely one of the many modifications of the Christian religion ; for, besides the error of representing the Christian religion as having many modifications, which it has not, the system of seeking salvation by human merit, is not only not of Christianity, but is absolutely inconsistent with it. It has no more to do with the religion of Christ, than darkness has with light ; than the service of Baal with that of the true God

I know it is fashionable in certain Protestant circles to speak of Rome as a *true church*, nay, as the mother church, from which it was, indeed, lawful to separate, on account of her many corruptions. Nay if the public journals give a fair report of the speeches of some of our senators on a late discussion of what are

called the 'Catholic claims,' it was distinctly maintained, that, unless the religion of Rome, were admitted to be a true religion, we could not maintain the truth of our own. It is the design of my present remarks, to shew that this is a great and dangerous error. If our own religion be, that we can contribute to our own salvation by our own merit, then, indeed, it is the same as that of Rome; but if our religion be that which Christ and his Apostles taught,—“By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast,” Eph. ii. 8, 9; then our religion is not the same, but the very opposite of that of Rome. It is the very opposite, not merely in modes of worship, and subordinate points of doctrine; it is radically and fundamentally another religion; and that of Rome is as much opposed to that of Christ, as any system of heathen idolatry practised in ancient or modern times.

It is time to have done with that spurious liberality that confounds right and wrong, in matters of divine revelation. Let not our Protestant population, especially let not our Protestant senators, halt between two opinions. If Baal be God, serve him, if Popery be Christianity, let them go over to it; if it be not Christianity, let it be regarded as it ought, as a system of delusion, invented by the Devil, for the purpose of counteracting and opposing the religion of Christ, which gives the most glorious display of divine mercy for the recovery of a ruined world.

. . . It was to the Church of Rome that the Apostle Paul said, “Thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches (the Church of the Jews) take heed lest he also spare not thee.” Rome did become high-minded,

and has been long, not only cut off from the spiritual body of Christ, but has actually become *the enemy of Christ*, and has a name given her by divine authority, "Mystery, Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."—*The Protestant*, Vol. II., p. 2—8.

(83.)—As the revelation of the truth and will of God is now completed, we have no reason to expect miracles; though it is no where expressly declared, that no more true miracles shall ever be performed: and perhaps such may be wrought on some future very extraordinary occasions, as the fall of Antichrist, the conversion of the Jews, or the calling of the Gentiles. But all the pretended miracles of the Church of Rome being performed in favour of idolatry, superstition, and anti-scriptural principles, claims, and practices, are so many proofs that she is the *principal Antichrist* foretold in the New Testament.—*Scott's Bible*, Deut. xiii. 1—5.

(84.)—Robert Grossetete or Grosthead, Bishop of Lincoln, said on his dying bed, in 1253,—“I am convinced that both the pope, unless he amend his errors, and the friars, except they endeavour to restrain him, will be deservedly exposed to everlasting death. Christ,” he said, conversing with his chaplains, “came into the world to save souls; ought not he, then, who takes pains to ruin souls to be denominated *Antichrist*?”—*Church of England Magazine*, Vol. iv., p. 270.

(85.)—Wickliffe in one of his homilies (on Rom. xiii.) affirms of the pontiff, ‘that he is not on Christ’s side, who put his soul for his sheep, but on the side of *Antichrist*, who putteth many souls for his pride. This man feedeth not the sheep of Christ, as Christ thrice commanded Peter ; but spoileth them, and slayeth them, and leadeth them many wrong ways.’—*Vaughan’s Life of Wickliffe*, Vol. II., p. 7.

(86.)—In Wickliffe’s MS. ‘of a feigned contemplative life,’ he says, . . . ‘Are not those priests heretics, who refuse to preach the Gospel of Christ, and compel other true men to leave preaching of it ? All laws opposed to this service, are opposed to God’s law, and reason and charity, and for the maintenance of pride and covetousness in *Antichrist’s* worldly clerks.’—*Ibid.* p. 19.

(87.)—It is not lawful to make a separation from the church, but we are not only enjoined to come out of the Church of *Antichrist*, but we see the fearful anger of the Lord, and have his dreadful threat thundered out against those who shall remain in Babylon, that synagogue of *Antichrist*.—*Bernard Gilpin*.

(88.)—If the Church of Rome be idolatrous, there can be neither calumny nor absurdity in calling her *Antichristian*, or the *Antichristian power* ; for nothing can be more *Antichristian* than idolatry.—*Bishop Burgess*. See *Christian Observer*, 1837, p. 177.

(89.)—"His Grace," (Dr. Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury,) "prays that the Church of Geneva may be 'united by the Spirit of Christ in the profession of pure evangelical faith, and also be for ever preserved from that *Antichristian* despotism' (Popery) 'which is equally hostile to intellectual improvement, to civil and religious liberty, and to *the fundamental principles of the Gospel.*'"—See *Christian Observer*, 1837, p. 260.

(90.)—When Bishop Hall finished his treatise (on the Divine Right of Episcopacy) he submitted it, before it went to press, to the final perusal of Archbishop Laud, who read it over with care and diligence. The treatise was in some places, altered by the Archbishop contrary to Bishop Hall's inclinations.

. . . His grace also was not pleased with the sentiment, that presbytery was of use, where episcopacy could not be obtained. But that which gave him the greatest offence was that Bishop Hall had positively and determinately bestowed the title of *Antichrist* upon the Pope: this his grace would by no means allow, as being so contrary to the judgment of many learned protestants, as well as his own. . . . According to this advice, Bishop Hall complied, though contrary to his own sentiments, to qualify some of his expressions, and to expunge others, 'to the contentment of his sovereign, the satisfaction of his metropolitan, and his own great honour.' So, in some few things, the celebrated treatise upon the Divine Right of Episcopacy, was modelled according to the views and sentiments of Laud.—*Bishop Hall's Life and Times*, by Rev. J. Jones.

(91.)—... Neither can I eat that word of mine (*Antichristianism*) unless I would renounce the Apostle, who seems purposely to decypher our Romanists by these lines. For, having immediately before described the condition of bishops and deacons, with their wives and children, allowing them indifferently with others a married estate, he presently, as foreseeing that point which would be most subject to contradiction, foretells that the seducing spirits of Antichristianism would forbid marriage; and this he fore-prophesies shall be done in the latter, or as their vulgate and rhemists term it, in the last times; and that by them, which shall speak lies in hypocrisy.—*Bishop Hall's Works*, Vol. IX., p. 339. Ed. 1808.

(92.)—The doctrine of transubstantiation is upon the whole, the most unscriptural, the most heretical, and the most *Antichristian* of all the novelties of Papal Rome. It is that which in itself and in its consequences chiefly distinguishes the Church of Rome from the Church of England. It was the test of heresy in Queen Mary's days when so many martyred Protestants died at the stake for the denial of it; and has been the chief test of Popery since the Reformation.—*Bishop Burgess*.

(93.)—A strict regard to truth, integrity, and justice will be the honour of Christ's kingdom. On the contrary *Antichrist* is described as coming 'with all deceivableness of unrighteousness,' or all the acts of unrighteous deceit. And without question, nothing has more tended to the corrupting the truth of the

Gospel, or weakening the power of it, than the giving encouragement to pious frauds and forgeries.—*Lowth.*

(94.)— . . . Concerning the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome, which he most wrongfully challengeth as the successor of Christ and Peter ; we may easily perceive how false, feigned, and forged it is, not only in that it hath no sufficient ground in Holy Scripture ; but also by the fruits and doctrine thereof. For our Saviour Christ and St. Peter teach most earnestly and agreeably obedience to kings, as to the chief and supreme Rulers in this world, next under God : but the Bishop of Rome teacheth, that they that are under him are free from all burdens and charges of the commonwealth, and obedience toward their prince, most clearly against Christ's doctrine and St. Peter's. He ought therefore rather to be called ANTICHRIST, and the successor of the scribes and pharisees, than Christ's vicar, or St. Peter's successor ; seeing that not only in this point, but also in other weighty matters of Christian religion—in matters of remission and forgiveness of sins, and of salvation—he teacheth so directly against both St. Peter, and against our Saviour Christ ; who not only taught obedience to kings, but also practised obedience in their conversation and living : for we read that they both paid tribute to the King.—*Homily of Obedience, Part III.*

(95.)— . . . But to conclude, and make an end, ye shall briefly take this short lesson ; wheresoever ye find the spirit of arrogance and pride, the spirit of

envy, hatred, contention, cruelty, murder, extortion, witchcraft, necromancy, &c. assure yourselves that there is the spirit of the devil, and not of God, albeit they pretend outwardly to the world never so much holiness. For, as the Gospel teacheth us, the Spirit of Jesus is a good spirit, an holy spirit, a sweet spirit, a lowly spirit, a merciful spirit, full of charity and love, full of forgiveness and pity, not rendering evil for evil, extremity for extremity, but overcoming evil with good, and remitting all offence even from the heart. According to which rule, if any man live uprightly, of him it may be safely pronounced, that he hath the Holy Ghost within him : if not, then it is a plain token that he doth usurp the name of the Holy Ghost in vain. Therefore, dearly beloved, according to the good counsel of St. John, believe not every spirit, but first try them whether they be of God or no. Many shall come in my name, saith Christ, and shall transform themselves into angels of light, deceiving, if it be possible, the very elect. They shall come unto you in sheep's clothing, being inwardly cruel and ravening wolves. They shall have an outward shew of great holiness and innocency of life, so that ye shall hardly or not at all discern them. But the rule that ye must follow is this, to judge them by their fruits : which if they be wicked and naught, then it is impossible that the tree of whom they proceed should be good. Such were all the Popes and Prelates of Rome for the most part ; as doth well appear in the story of their lives ; and, therefore, they are worthily accounted among the number of false prophets, and *false christ's*, which deceived the world a long while. The Lord of heaven and earth defend us from their tyranny and pride ; that they never enter into his vineyard again, to the disturbance of his silly

poor flock ; but that they may be utterly confounded and put to flight in all parts of the world. And he of his great mercy, so work in all men's hearts, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable Gospel of his Son Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places ; to the beating down of sin, death, the pope, the devil, and all the kingdom of *Antichrist* ; that, the scattered and dispersed sheep being at length gathered into one fold, we may in the end rest all together in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ; there to be partakers of eternal and everlasting life, through the merits and death of Jesus Christ our Saviour.—*Homily for Whitsunday, Part II.*

(96)—. . . And lest, my lords, ye may peradventure think thus barely to call the bishop of Rome, Christ's adversary, or, to speak it in plain terms, to call him *Antichrist*, that it is done in mine anguish, and that I do but rage, and as a desperate man do not care what I say, or upon whom I do rail, therefore that your lordships may perceive my mind, and thereby understand that I speak the words of truth and of sobriety, as St. Paul said unto Festus, be it known unto your lordships all, that as concerning the bishop of Rome, I neither hate the person nor the place. For I ensure (assure) your lordships, the living Lord beareth me witness before whom I speak, I do think many a good holy man, many martyrs and saints of God, have sat and taught in that place Christ's gospel truly ; which therefore justly may be called apostolici, that is, true disciples of the apostles, and also of that church and congregation of Christians, apostolic church, yea and

that certain hundred years after the same was first erected and builded upon Christ, by the true apostolical doctrine taught by the mouths of the apostles themselves.

If ye will know how long that was, and how many hundred of years, to be curious in pointing the precise number of years, I will not be too bold : but thus I say, so long and so many hundred years as that see did truly teach and preach that gospel, that religion, exercised that power, and ordered every thing by those laws and rules, which that see received of the apostles, and as Tertullian saith, the apostles of Christ, and Christ of God ; so long, I say, that see might well have been called Peter and Paul's chair and see, or rather Christ's chair, and the bishop thereof Apostolicus, or a true disciple and successor of the Apostles, and a minister of Christ. But since the time that that see hath degenerated from the trade (practice) of truth and true religion, the which it received of the apostles at the beginning ; and hath preached another Gospel, hath set up another religion, hath exercised another power, and hath taken upon it to order and rule the Church of Christ by other strange laws, canons and rules, than ever it received of the apostles, or the apostles of Christ, which things it doth at this day, and hath continued so doing, alas, alas, of too too long a time—since the time, I say, that the state and condition of that see hath thus been changed, in truth it ought, of duty and right, *to have the names changed, both of the see and of the sitter therein.* For understand, my lords, it was neither for the privilege of the place or person thereof, that that see and bishop thereof were called apostolic, but for the true trade of Christ's religion, which was taught and maintained in that see at the first, and of those godly men. And therefore,

as truly and justly as that see then, for that true trade of religion and consanguinity of doctrine with the religion and doctrine of Christ's apostles, was called apostolic ; *so as truly and as justly, for the contrariety of religion and diversity of doctrine from Christ and his apostles, that see and the bishop thereof at this day both ought to be called, and are indeed ANTICHRISTIAN.*

The see is the seat of Satan, and the bishop of the same, that maintaineth the abominations thereof, is *Antichrist* himself indeed. And for the same causes this see at this day is the same which St. John calleth in his Revelation, Babylon, or the whore of Babylon, and spiritually Sodoma and Egyptus, the mother of fornications, and of the abominations upon the earth. And with this whore doth spiritually mell (meddle), and lieth with her and committeth most abominable adultery before God, all those kings and princes, yea and all nations of the earth, which do consent to her abominations, and use or practise the same ; that is, of the innumerable multitude of them to rehearse some for example sake, her dispensations, her pardons, and pilgrimages, her invocation of saints, her worshipping of images, her false counterfeit religion in her monkery and friarage, and her traditions whereby God's laws are defiled ; as her massing and false ministering of God's word and the sacraments of Christ, clean contrary to Christ's word and the apostles' doctrine, whereof in particularity I have touched something before in my talk had with the see of London, and in other treatises more at large ; wherein, if it shall please God to bring the same to light, it shall appear I trust by God's grace plainly to the man of God, and to him whose rule in judgment of religion is God's word, that that religion, that rule and order, that doctrine and faith,

which this whore of Babylon and the beast whereupon she doth sit maintaineth at this day with all violence of fire and sword, with spoil and banishment (according to Daniel's prophecy), and finally with all falsehood, deceit, hypocrisy, and all kind of ungodliness—are as clean contrary to God's word as darkness is unto light, or light to darkness, white to black, or black to white, or as Belial unto Christ, or Christ unto Antichrist himself.—*Bishop Ridley. See Letters of the Martyrs, by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, p. 73.*

(97.) . . . As the pope taketh upon him to give the temporal sword or royal and imperial power to kings and princes, so doth he likewise take upon him to depose them from their imperial states, if they be disobedient to him ; and commandeth the subjects to disobey their princes, assoiling (freeing) the subjects as well of their obedience, as of their lawful oaths made unto their true kings and princes—directly contrary to God's commandment, who commandeth all subjects to obey their kings or other rulers under them. One John, Patriarch of Constantinople in the time of St. Gregory, claimed superiority above all other bishops ; to whom St. Gregory writeth, that therein he did injury to his brethren which were equal with him, that is to say, the bishop of Rome, of Alexandria, and of Antiochia, in which were patriarchal sees, as well as Constantinople, and were brethren one to another. But, saith St. Gregory, if any one shalt exalt himself above all the rest to be the universal bishop, the same passeth (surpasseth) in pride : but now the bishop of Rome exalteth himself, not only above all bishops, but also above all kings and emperors, and above the whole

world, taking upon him to give and take away, to set up and put down, as he shall think good. And as the devil, having no such authority, yet took upon him to give unto Christ all the kingdoms of the world, if he would fall down and worship him : in like manner the pope taketh upon him to give empires and kingdoms, being none of his, to such as will fall down and worship him, and kiss his feet. And, moreover, his lawyers and glossers (flatterers) so flatter him, that they say he may command emperors and kings to hold his stirrup when he lighteth upon his horse ; and to be his footmen ; and that if any emperor or king give him any thing, they give him nothing but that is his own, and that he may dispense against God's word, against the Old and New Testament, against St. Paul's Epistles, and against the Gospel. And furthermore, whatsoever he doth, although he draw innumerable people by heaps with himself into hell, yet may no mortal man reprove him ; because he, being judge of all men, may be judged of no man ; and thus he sitteth in the temple of God, as he were a god, and nameth himself God's vicar, and yet he dispenseth against God. If this be not to play *Antichrist's* part, I cannot tell what is *Antichrist*, (which is no more to say, but Christ's enemy and adversary ;) who shall sit in the temple of God, advancing himself above all other, yet by hypocrisy and feigned religion shall subvert the true religion of Christ, and, under pretence and colour of Christian religion, shall work against Christ, and therefore hath the name of *Antichrist*. Now if any man lift himself higher than the pope hath done, who lifteth himself above all the world : or can be more adversary to Christ, than to dispense against God's laws ; and where Christ hath given any commandment, to command directly the contrary ; that man must needs be taken

for Antichrist. But until the time that such a person may be found, men may easily conjecture where to find Antichrist. *Archbishop Cranmer. See Letters of the Martyrs, by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, p. 9.*

(98.)—Cranmer, in his book on the sacrament, after showing that Christ ‘made a sacrifice and oblation of his own body upon the cross which was a full redemption and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world’ adds, ‘but the Romish *Antichrist* to deface this great benefit of Christ, has taught that his sacrifice upon the cross is not sufficient hereunto, without another sacrifice devised by him, and made by the priest, or else without indulgences, beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other pelfray to supply Christ’s imperfection. . . . O heinous blasphemy and most detestable injury against Christ! O wicked abominations in the temple of God! O pride intolerable of *Antichrist*, and most manifest token of the son of perdition, extolling himself above God, and with Lucifer exalting his seat and power above the throne of God! For he that taketh upon him to supply that thing which he pretends to be imperfect in Christ, must needs make himself above Christ and so very *Antichrist*.’

At the stake Cranmer says: ‘As for the pope I refuse him as Christ’s enemy and the *Antichrist* with all his false doctrine.’

Latimer in prison before his martyrdom says: ‘What fellowship hath Christ with *Antichrist*? Therefore it is not lawful to bear the yoke with the papists. Come forth from among them, and separate yourselves from them saith the Lord. It is one thing to be the the Church indeed, another thing to counterfeit the Church.’

Bradford in a letter to Lady Vane says :—‘ The usurped authority of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome is undoubtedly that great *Antichrist* of whom the apostles do so much admonish us.’

At the stake Bradford said :—‘ O England, England, repent thee of thy sins ! repent thee of thy sins ! Beware of idolatry, beware of false *Antichrists*, take heed they do not deceive you.’

Hooper in his Declaration of Christ says :—‘ The very properties of *Antichrist*, I mean of Christ’s great and principal enemy, are so openly known to all men that are not blinded with the smoke of Rome, that they know him to be the beast that John describes in the *Apocalypse*.’

‘ You cannot be a partaker of God’s religion and *Antichrist*’s service, whereof the mass is the most principal, *You cannot be a member of Christ’s church, and a member of the pope’s church.*’—Bradford. ‘ You know, if you will, these matters of the Romish supremacy and the *Antichristian* transubstantiation, whereby Christ’s supper is overthrown, his priesthood evacuate, his sacrifice frustrate, the ministry of his word unplaced, repentance repelled, faith fainted, godliness extinguished, the mass maintained, idolatry supported, and all impiety cherished. You know, I say, if you will, that these opinions are not only beside God’s word but even directly against it, and therefore to take part with them is to take part against God against whom you cannot prevail’.—Bradford to the University and Town of Cambridge. See *Record Newspaper*, Oct. 9, 1837 and Feb. 8, 1838.

(99.)—We can do no greater injury to the true church of Christ than to seem to have forsaken her and

disallow her by cleaving to her adversary. . . . How can a Christian man think it tolerable to be present at the popish mass? St. John telleth us plainly that none of those who are written in the book of life do receive the mark of the beast, which is of the Papistical synagogue, either on their foreheads, or else in their hands i. e. apparently or obediently.—*Philpot*.

(100.)— . . . Let us reprove the works of darkness ; let us fly from all idolatry ; let us abhor the *antichristian* and Romish rotten service ; detest the popish mass ; renounce their Romish god ; prepare ourselves to the cross, &c.—*Bradford*. See *Church of England Magazine*, Dec. 1838, p. 383.

(101.)—You (Mr. Charles Butler) complain in your last paragraph that your religion is traduced, and your ancestors vilified. Sir, I must speak decidedly. *I believe your religion to be the Antichrist of scripture, and that if I cease to oppose it, I do a great wickedness, and sin against God.* I may repent of many things ; but when it shall please God that my accountable spirit shall be disembodied, and return to my Maker, I shall then look back with joy to my humble labours, in support of pure, primitive, reformed Christianity. I am pleading for the faith for which our bishops and our other martyrs perished in the flames. The same truths respecting the Church of Rome, which those noble spirits taught from the pulpit, the rack, and the fire, their descendants must continue to enforce, against the smiles, and bows, and plausible courtesies, and candid professions, of an indolent and luxurious age, which has forgotten the uncompromising, unbending firmness of their Fathers : and mistakes indifference,

for toleration, weakness, for benevolence, and surrendering the fortress to the enemy, for magnanimity and love of peace.—*The accusations of History against the Church of Rome*, by Rev. G. Townsend, p. 460.

(102.)—The forced celibacy of the clergy, was strenuously defended by Dunstan ; . . . If there is one doctrine clearly laid down in Scripture, it is this, “ that marriage is honourable in all.” We read, “ a bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife,”—and that St. Paul had power to marry if he pleased. The forbidding to marry, is one of the signs of the predicted apostasy ; and one of the many reasons which induce the Protestants to conclude, that the Church of Rome is the *Antichrist*, which should corrupt the true Catholic Church of Christ.

. . . The Reformation, as Bishop Warburton justly observes, was begun and carried on, upon this very principle, that the pope was *Antichrist*.—*The Accusations of History against the Church of Rome*, by Rev. G. Townsend. pp. 75. 195.

(103.)—The Church of Scotland says in the Confession of Faith :—“ There is no other Head of the Church than the Lord Jesus Christ, nor can any Pope of Rome be in any sense the Head thereof ; but is that *Antichrist*, that man of sin, and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God.”—*Scotch Confession*, Ch. 25. S. 6.

(104.)—The Church of Ireland says in the Articles of the Irish Church drawn up by Archbishop Usher, § 80. ‘ The Bishop of Rome is so far from being the

Supreme Head of the Universal Church of Christ, that his works and doctrine do plainly discover him to be that *man of sin* foretold in the Holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and abolish with the brightness of his coming.'

(105.)—As Christ is the head of the church, which is his body, so *Antichrist* is the head of the Romish Church, which is *his* body :—He is one, who under a colour of being for Christ, and under title of his vice-gent, exalteth himself above and against Christ ; opposing himself unto him in all his offices and ordinances both in church and commonwealth ; bearing authority in the church of God ; ruling over that city with seven hills, which did bear rule over nations and put our Lord to death : a man of sin ; a harlot ; a mother of spiritual fornications to the kings and people of the nations ; a child of perdition and a destroyer ; establishing himself by lying miracles and false wonders. All which marks together do agree with none but the Pope of Rome.—*Usher's Body of Divinity*, 1658. p. 438.

(106.)—" If any man worship the beast and his image, the same shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of God and of his Holy Angels," Rev. xiv. 10. This in the 9th verse is " the portion of them that worship the beast," that is the Pope, " and receive the mark of his name."—*Archbishop Usher's Sermons*, No. viii. on Rev. xxi. 8.

(107.)—. . . This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth teach her fol-

lowers to tread, when they ask her the way to justification. I cannot stand now to unrip this building, and sift it piece by piece ; only 'I will pass it by in few words,—that that may befall Babylon in the presence of that which God hath builded, as happened unto Dagon before the ark.—*Hooker. See Christian Observer for 1836, p. 801.*

(108.)—... There is a book concerning Antichrist, in an old manuscript, which contains many sermons of the pastors ; it is dated 1120, and therefore was written before the time of Waldo. The existence, therefore, of these churches is still further proved to have taken place before the days of that reformer. The treatise concerning Antichrist was preserved by the Waldenses of the Alps ; and a brief summary of it is as follows :—‘ He is called Antichrist, because, being covered and adorned under the colour of Christ and his church, he opposes the salvation purchased by Christ, of which the faithful are partakers by faith, hope, and charity. He contradicts the truth by the wisdom of the world, and by counterfeit holiness. To make up a complete system of religious hypocrisy, all these things must concur ; there must be worldly-wise men, there must be religious orders, pharisees, ministers, doctors, the secular power, and lovers of this world. Antichrist, indeed, was conceived in the apostles’ times, but he was in his infancy, unformed and imperfect. He was therefore the more easily known and ejected, being rude, raw, and wanting utterance. He had then no skill in making decretals, he wanted hypocritical ministers, and the show of religious orders. He had none of those riches, by which he might allure ministers to his service, and multiply his adherents ; he

wanted also the secular power, and could not compel men to serve him : but he grew to a full age, when the lovers of the world both in church and state, did multiply and get all the power into their hands. Christ had never any enemy like to this, so able to pervert the way of truth into falshood, insomuch that the church with her true children is trodden under foot. He robs Christ of his merits of justification, regeneration, sanctification, and spiritual nourishment, and ascribes the same to his own authority, to a form of words, to his own works, to saints, and to the fire of purgatory : Yet he has some decent qualities, which throw a veil over his enormities ; such as an external profession of Christianity, tradition, and catalogues of episcopal succession, lying wonders, external sanctity, and certain sayings of Christ himself, the administration of the sacraments, verbal preaching against vices, and the virtuous lives of some who really live to God in Babylon, whom, however, Antichrist so far as in him lies, prevents from placing all their hope in Christ alone. These things are a cloak, with which Antichrist hides his wickedness, that he may not be rejected as a pagan. Knowing these things, we depart from Antichrist, according to express scriptural directions. We unite ourselves to the truth of Christ and his spouse, how small soever she appear. We describe the causes of our separation from Antichrist that if the Lord be pleased to impart the knowledge of the same truth to others, those, who receive it, together with us, may love it. But if they be not sufficiently enlightened, they may receive help by our ministry, and be washed by the Spirit. If any one have received more abundantly than we ourselves, we desire the more humbly to be taught, and to amend our defects. A various and endless idolatry marks the genius of Antichrist, and he

teaches men by that to seek for grace, which is essentially in God alone, exists meritoriously in Christ, and is communicated by faith alone through the Holy Spirit.' They then proceed to confute distinctly the various abominations of popery, on which points it is, at this day, unnecessary to enlarge. Suffice it to say, that to see and argue as they did in that dark age, required a wonderful light, and strength of judgment.—*Milner's History of the Church*, V. iii. p. 475—478.

(109.)— . . . 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12. "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie. That they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

The sin of those who are seduced by Antichrist was mentioned in the foregoing verse, the judgment of such is here declared in these verses, which is twofold, delusion in this world, and damnation in the next. 1. Delusion in this world. Here note, 1. The author of this judgment, *God shall send them strong delusions*; as it is a sin, God has no hand in it; but as it is a punishment, God has to do in it, there is a judicial traduction or delivering them up to a spirit of error, who do not receive the truth in the love of it, and this without the least shadow of unrighteousness, punishing sin with sin. Note, 2. The degree or nature of the punishment: delusions, *strong delusions*: given up to the efficacy of error, which is discovered by the absurdity of those errors which they cleave unto, and by the obstinacy wherewith they cleave unto them. Learn hence, (1) That strong delusions may be, and sometimes are, of God's own sending. (2) That by God's just judgment there is an infatuation upon the followers and abettors of Antichrist, that they swallow

the grossest errors, and believe the strongest delusions, to their own destruction. Note, (3.) The issue and result of this punishment, *That they should believe a lie*: false doctrines are often called a lie in scripture: all the doctrine of the man of sin, with which he hath deceived the world, under the notion of truth, is one great lie; but besides this, he approves and applauds the doctrine of equivocation, and teaches, that in many cases it is necessary, and in some very lawful, to lie; these they call pious frauds, but they are indeed diabolical forgeries. Observe, 2. Their dreadful punishment in the other world, *That they all might be damned, &c.* Where mark, the punishment itself, damnation, for filling up the measure of their obduration, together with the justice and equity of it; expressed negatively, *they believed not the truth*, received it not with simplicity of mind, to be instructed and directed by it; positively, *they had pleasure in unrighteousness*, in unrighteous doctrines and practices. Learn hence, 1. That errors in judgment, as well as sins in practice, may bring damnation upon the souls of men. Error is as damnable as vice, for it is as contrary to the law of God as vice is. Learn, 2. That though all errors may bring damnation upon men's souls, yet some may be said more especially than others to be damning errors: such are the errors of Antichrist, the man of sin. Oh, how dangerous then is it to be found amongst his followers! To be sharers with them in their sins, will render us partakers of their plagues. —*Burkitt in loco.*

(110.)—This Epistle (2 Thess.)...begins with a devout acknowledgment to God, for the eminent attainments which the Thessalonians had made in religion, and par-

ticularly for the zeal and fidelity with which they adhered to the Christian cause in the midst of persecution. To support and animate them under their trials, the apostle reminds them of the distinguished honour that would be conferred on all the saints at the coming of Christ, and the vengeance that would at the same time overtake all the enemies of the gospel, assuring them of his constant prayers for their farther improvement in the christian character, in order to their attaining the felicity that was promised. But lest, by mistaking the meaning of what he had said, or wrote to them at any time upon that subject, or by any other means, they should be deceived into an opinion that the judgment day was near at hand, he informs them that before this awful period, there would be a grand apostasy in the church, and an *antichristian power*, which he calls *the man of sin*, would arise, and greatly obstruct the progress of the gospel, arrogantly assuming to itself the divine authority, and by pretended miracles leading multitudes into the grossest and most fatal delusions. Some beginnings of this spirit, he observes, were already discoverable, and as soon as those restraints which then lay upon it were removed, it would break out in all its force, and continue to spread its malignant influence, till it should be finally destroyed by the coming of Christ. . . .

The attentive reader will easily perceive that this, though the shortest of all St. Paul's Epistles to the churches, is not inferior to any of them in the sublimity of the sentiments, and in that excellent spirit by which all the writings of the apostle are distinguished. Besides those marks of its genuineness and divine authority, which it bears in common with the rest of these Epistles, it has one peculiar to itself from the exact representation it contains of the papal power,

under the characters of the *man of sin*, and the *mystery of iniquity*. For, considering how directly opposite the principles here described were to the genius of Christianity, it must have appeared, at the time when this Epistle was written, highly improbable to all human apprehension, that they should ever have prevailed in the christian church; and consequently a prediction like this, which answers so exactly in every particular to the event, must be allowed to carry its own evidence along with it, and to prove that the author of it wrote under a divine influence. For a farther illustration of this argument, see Dr. Benson's *Dissertation on the Man of Sin*.*—*Doddridge's Family Expositor*. Introduction to 2 Thess.

(111.)—The catholic church, I believe, shall never totally fail, that is Christianity shall never utterly perish from the face of the earth, but there shall be some to maintain and uphold it to the end of the world, although some of the ancient doctors of the church have given us a very tragical description of the state of the universal Church of Christ, which shall be under the reign of the great *Antichrist*. But I know of no promise of indefectibility from the faith made to any particular church, no, not to the Church of Rome itself. And if we may judge by the Holy Scriptures, and by the doctrine and practice of the primitive catholic church, the present Church of Rome hath already lamentably failed, and fallen into many dangerous and gross errors, as will by and by appear. Now that church which hath already so far failed, why may she not utterly fail? If she be found but in one error, the infallible direction of her judgment, upon which her indefectibi-

* See Appendix to this volume.

lity from the faith must depend, is gone and destroyed. I add that divers eminent doctors, even of the Roman communion, have discovered, out of the Apocalypse, that Rome itself shall at length become the seat of *Antichrist*. If so, where will the Church of Rome then be?—*Bishop Bull's Corruptions of the Church of Rome. Published by Christian Knowledge Society, p. 17.*

(112.)... Antichristianism in the Roman Church did not presently come to that maturity, nor was the papal power so soon advanced to that prodigious height and greatness, &c.—*Ibid. p. 62.*

(113.)—The Homilies of the Church maintain in clear and explicit language the fundamental principle of man's salvation by the redemption of Christ. This fundamental principle, the Church of Rome effectually denies—every ordinance of that Church is founded on a denial of this salvation—she is, therefore, *Antichristian*; and the man who is regardless of the religion of that Church, is regardless of the very foundation of salvation for his fellow-sinners.—*Truth and Error Contrasted, by the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, p. 193.*

(114.)—... Union of members among themselves and with their head is very good, if the members be united in truth, (for else it may be a conspiracy,) and if by *head* be meant Jesus Christ; and indeed this is the only true sign of the church; but if by *head* be meant the Roman pope, it may be *ecclesia malignantium*, and *Antichrist* may sit in the chair.

... Miracles were in the beginning of Christianity a

note of true believers; Christ told us so. And he also taught us that *Antichrist* should be revealed in lying signs and wonders, and commanded us by that token to take heed of them.—*A Dissuasive from Popery by Bishop Jeremy Taylor. See Enchirid. Theol. Anti Romanum* Vol. I. p. 183.

(115.)—" *He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow,*" is an observation which holdeth true of no part of knowledge so much as of the knowledge of mankind. It is some relief to him who knows nothing of foreign wickedness, to hope there are other nations wherein virtue is honoured, and religion is in esteem; which allays his regrets, when he sees vice and impiety abound in his own country: but if by travelling or reading he enlarge his horizon, and know mankind better, his regrets will grow, when he finds the whole world lies in wickedness. It argues a cruel and inhuman temper to delight in beholding scenes of horror and misery; and certainly none, who either honours his Maker and Redeemer, or is a lover of mankind, can without sorrow look on and see the indignities done to God and his Son Christ, and see the enemy of the human race triumphing over the world with such absolute authority, and so much enraged cruelty; and that not only in the dark region of it, which the Son of righteousness hath not yet visited with his gospel, but that where Christ should have a throne Satan's seat should also be, is justly surprising and astonishing. That almost all Christendom hath fallen from their first love, is what none, whose eyes are open, can deny; and it is little less evident, that the greater part of it hath made shipwreck and erred from the faith; and that the church, whose *faith was once spoken of through-*

out the world, is now become the *mother of the fornications of the earth*. It is true, the scriptures warned us of a *falling away*, of a *mystery of iniquity*, of an **ANTICHRIST** to be revealed in due time, and of a *Babylonish Rome*, which should bewitch the earth with her sorceries, but should be varnished over with fair colours and specious pretences, so that *mystery* should be on her forehead. Being then warned of so much danger to the Christian religion, it is a necessary, though painful, inquiry to see if this *Antichrist* be yet come, or if we must look for another.

But because some have stretched the notion of *Antichristianism* so far, that things harmless and innocent come within its compass; and others have so much contracted it, that they might scape free; we are to take a view of the nature and designs of the Christian religion, and to conclude from that what must be *Antichristianism*: it being not only a bare contradiction to some branches or parts of the gospel, (for then every error or heresy were Antichristianism,) but a design and entire complex of such opinions and practices as are contradictory to and subversive of the power and life of Christianity; and if we find any such thing to be broached and received into the world, we may with the least hazard of uncharitableness, pronounce it to be *Antichristianism*; and if it be acted or animated by any head, he may be concluded Antichrist." . . .

Having taken a view of the nature and designs of the Christian religion, the writer proceeds: " I hold it not necessary to dwell on a further deduction of those generals into more particular branches, nor to make this scheme of religion good by any longer proof, the position I have laid down being so obvious to the reason of every considering person; wherefore I go on to

examine if there be any such system of doctrines or opinions among pretenders to Christianity, which tends to the overthrowing and enervating this whole design, and whose characters are directly opposite to these I have mentioned; and the less avowed and the more disguised that society be, as it is more likely to prevail, since error and vice are not so formidable in their own colours as when veiled with the pretences of truth and virtue; so it will better agree with that great character the prophecies give of this defection, that it was a *mystery, and had mystery on its forehead*, Rev. xvii. 15.

And here remains the sad part of my discourse; for what lover of mankind can with pleasure either satisfy his own reason, or convince the judgment of others, in a matter the issue whereof is to prove so great a part of the Christian societies to be Antichristian and adulterate? And certainly, if my love to truth, and the honour of my Redeemer and his gospel, and by consequence a zeal for souls, did not engage me to this search, I could easily quit the task, and choose more easy and pleasant subjects for the exercise of my thoughts; but the wisdom of God having declared it a part of wisdom to observe the characters of the *Antichristian beast*, I therefore, though not without pain, engage in the survey of it.

And first, in the entry it will be a bad omen, of no good to be expected from any society that shall study to keep her members in ignorance, and to bar them the study of the holy scriptures, which being the revelation of the whole counsel of God, and written by plain and simple men, and at first directed to the use of the rude illiterate vulgar, for teaching them the mysteries of godliness and the path of life, it is a shrewd indication, that if any studied to hide this light under a

candlestick, that to keep it in an unknown tongue, or forbid the body of Christians the use of it, (though its native tendency be to enlighten the understanding and to inflame the will, it being given out by God for that end,) that those must be conscious to themselves of great deformity to that rule, and apprehend that if it were more known their doctrine would be less believed, especially since the hardest part of the scriptures are the writings of the Old Testament; and yet these were communicated to all of that dispensation, who were commanded by Christ to search them, and who did educate their children in them, continuing that holy care to a high degree even to this day. Now, except it be said that it is fitter all be kept under darkness in the new dispensation than it was in the old, no account can be given for the zeal is used in any church to keep their children in such ignorance; and yet this is a part of the distinguishing characters of the new dispensation from the old, that light hath appeared in it. Now all may know how guilty those of Rome are in this; what pains are taken to detract from the authority of the scriptures; how they quarrel, sometimes its darkness, sometimes its ambiguousness, sometimes the genuineness of its originals, and always complain of its being too much perused, and therefore let as little of it be put in vulgar tongues as can be; read it publicly in an unknown tongue, and permit no private person the use of it without allowance from his confessor: of which though in some places the reformation hath made them more liberal, yet where there is no hazard of that, they betray their aversion for the scriptures too palpably in all their writings and discourses.

But now to pursue my design more closely, I must call to mind the first branch of the Christian religion, which teacheth how God is to be worshipped in a pure

and spiritual way ; and see how far this is contradicted. And here I must consider the idolatry of the Gentiles, which was of two kinds : the one was, when the true God was worshipped in a false manner ; the other was, when divine adoration was offered to those who were no gods. Of the first I shall reckon two kinds : the first was, when an image or figure was erected for representing the Deity to the senses, and adoration offered to God through it ; in which case, though perhaps the herd did formally worship the image, yet their philosophers declared they meant these only for exciting the senses, and imagination, and not for being worshipped ; much less that the Deity should be conceived like unto them, as we find both in Celsus, Julian, and Maximus Tyrius. Now this form of adoration is contrary both to the divine essence and command ; for God must either be conceived like such an image or not. If like to it, then a great indignity is done to the divine nature, greater than if a toad or a worm were set out as the image of a king to have civil reverence paid to it ; since he is of his own essence incomprehensible and invisible, and so hath no shape or figure. In a word, it abases our thoughts of God, when we figure him to ourselves. But if we conceive God not like such an image, then why is it used, except to be a snare to the vulgar, who will be ready to think God like unto it ? and certain it is, that whatever the more refined or abstracted wits may conceive of these images, yet the vulgar offer up their adorations directly to them, and conceive God to be like unto them.

This worship is also contrary to the Divine precept, who made it one of the Ten Commandments which himself delivered to his people, *Exod. xx. 4.*—that *no graven image nor likeness should be made to be worshipped.* And the reason given shews the law was

perpetual, *for God is ever jealous of the glory due to him.* Now what kindness those of Rome have to this command may be guessed by their striking it out of their Catechisms, as if it were only an appendix of the first : but if we read the whole Old Testament, it will furnish us with large discoveries of God's displeasure at this kind of worship, to which the Jews were so inclinable ; *but God would not give his praise to graven images,* Isa. xlii. 8. Now here it is to be remembered, that the Jewish dispensation was low and carnal when compared to that to which we are called : if then this worship was not allowed of to them, it is much less to be allowed of among Christians.

. . . The title of *whoredom*, given to idolatry so often in the Old Testament, is to be considered ; the importance whereof is, that God by covenanting with his people is married to them, to be their God ; and the conjugal duty they owe him is adoration : when therefore other creatures have any share of that bestowed on them, spiritual whoredom is committed.

Now how sad the application of this to the Christian Church must be, all may judge, who know how great a part of Christendom worship God by images, and how the adored and incomprehensible Trinity is painted as an old man with a child in his arms, and a dove over the child's head ; though *no man hath seen the Father at any time,* John vi. 46. And the Son, as God, can no more be represented by an image than the Father ; and the Holy Ghost, though once appearing in the symbolical representation of a dove, cannot, without idolatry, be represented and worshipped under that figure. Neither can any apology be offered for this, which could not, with the same reason, have cleared both Jews and Gentiles of idolatry. And whatever more abstracted minds may think of these

images, yet none that considers the simplicity of the vulgar, the frailty of man, and his inclination to apprehend all things as sensible, can doubt but that the rabble do really conceive of God as like these figures, and do plainly worship them. It is further to be considered, that though the Son of God was man, yet as man he is not to be worshipped ; and therefore the setting out of figures and statues for his human nature, (which by the way are no real adumbrations, but only the fancies of painters,) and worshipping these as the images of the Son of God, is no less idolatry than to worship the Father as an old man.

And further, the worship of the mass is idolatry as evidently as any piece of Gentilism ever was ; for if it be certain that Christ is not in the hostie, which shall be afterwards made out, then to adore him as there, must be idolatrous. Neither will it serve for excuse to say that Christ is truly worshipped as present ; and if he be not there, it is only a mistake about the presence, but no idolatry can be committed, the worship being offered to a proper object, who is God. But if this apology free them of idolatry, it will also clear those heathens who worshipped some statues or creatures in which they conceived God was present ; so that they might have pleaded it was the great and true God they adored, believing him there present, as their fathers had formerly believed. But he were very gentle to idolaters who upon such a plea would clear them of that crime. What then is to be said of that Church that holds it the greatest piece of her religion to adore the bread with the same devotion they would pay to Christ were he visibly present ; who call the bread God, carry it about in processions, and worship it with all the solemnity imaginable ? And finally, the worship they give the cross is like-

wise an adoring of God under a symbol and representation. And thus we have seen the parallel of Rome-Heathen and Rome-Christian runs but too just.

But the next kind of the heathens' idolatry was their worshipping of others beside God ; whom they held of two ranks : some that were so pure that they never dwelt in bodies ; others they judged to be the souls of deceased men, after their death acknowledged and honoured with Divine honour. And this kind of idolatry was first begun at Babylon, where Niaus made the statue of his father Belus be set up, and worshipped it : and from him all these lesser gods were called Belim or Baalim. Now concerning these, the heathens believed that they were certain intermedial powers that went betwixt God and men, by whom all good things were conveyed to mortals, by whom also all our services were offered to the gods. Thus the nations had *gods many and lords many*, 1 Cor. viii. 5. And these lesser deities or demons they adored by erecting statues to them about their burial-places, where they built temples for them, and worshipped them. And from this hint of Babylon's being the mother of this kind of idolatry we may guess why the apostasy of that city, which, in St. John's days, *did reign over the kingdoms of the earth*, Rev. xvii. 18, is shadowed forth under the name of *Babylon* ; to hold out, that the corruption it was to fall into was to be of a kind with that begun in Babylon ; and the character of a whore doth likewise agree well with this.

Now if we compare with this the worship of angels and saints in the Roman Church, we shall find the parity just and exact. For after the conversion of the Roman empire, it is not to be denied, but that in order to the gaining of a heathen world to a compliance with Christianity, the Christians did, as near

as was possible, accommodate themselves to the heathenish customs: and therefore, instead of their gods, they set up the demon and Baal-worship to the apostles and other saints and martyrs; which Theodoret doth most ingenuously acknowledge to have been set in the stead of their gods. They became afterwards so exact in the parallel, that as the heathens had of these lesser gods for every nation, so there was a saint appointed for every nation: St. Andrew for Scotland, St. George for England, St. Patrick for Ireland, and many more for other nations. And as every house among the heathen had their household god, so every person was taught to have a tutelar saint and angel. And as among the heathen there were gods for all trades, for all sicknesses, and for every virtue; so in Antichristianism there were saints for every disease, for every profession, and for all the graces. And as the heathens built temples for them, so did also Babylonish Rome. . . . And here it were too long to reckon up the abominations of this saint-worship which are offered to the Virgin, with the blasphemous titles given her, and prayers made to her; as if she were more merciful and gentle to sinners than her blessed Son. What shall I tell of the whole Psalms turned to her? the words of Goddess and Lady being put in the place of God and Lord: and that from the eleventh century, in which the form of the numbering their prayers by beads was begun, ten go to the Virgin for one to God. How many more worship her than do her Son! How many more churches are built to her than to her Son! And how many pilgrimages are made to her shrines and relics! And thus I think, little doubting will remain, that the worship of the Baalim, begun at Babylon, is now set up in the Christian Rome.

... And will the poor distinctions of *dulia* and *latria* save them from this guilt? Alas! these are parts of the mystery by which they would veil their abominations; but their nakedness is not hid with this thin veil. For we see how simply all religious worship offered to creatures displeased God. . . . These nice distinctions, which the schoolmen have devised, will serve in no stead in the great day, *when God's jealousy shall burn like fire against all that have dishonoured him by this profane worshipping of creatures.*" — *A Discourse on the opposition of the Doctrine, Worship and Practice of the Roman Church, to the Nature, Designs, and Characters of the Christian Faith: by Gilbert Burnet, D.D. Bishop of Salisbury. See Enchirid. Theol. Anti-Roman. Vol. III. pp. 1—14.*

(116.) . . . It was the judgment of the ancient church, that Antichrist, like Judas, should be a professed friend to Christ—a counter-Christ, as the etymology of his name implies, or, according to one of the impious titles assumed by the pope, his *vicar*—upholding a counter-system to the mystery of godliness, in the mystery of iniquity. Now, such is the exact character of popery. Under a mask of Christian names, it substitutes a system which counterworks and neutralises the ends of Christianity. The doctrines of the gospel are, no doubt, retained by the Romish Church, as the Bible itself is retained. But both are considered too spiritual and elevated for daily and general use, and are, in fact, superseded. Thus the saints take the place of the Saviour. Human traditions undermine the authority, and human interpretations pervert the meaning of the Scriptures. The absurd and idolatrous sacrifice of the

mass, conceals from the view of sinners the one great sacrifice which taketh away the sin of the world. For the invisible Head of the Church, which is Christ's body, you have the pope at Rome, a visible, but an impotent and impious representative; and to consummate the impiety, with a matchless effrontery in those who make the lie, and with strong delusion in those who believe and love it, you have presented "the real presence of the body and blood with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ," in the transubstantiated wafer!

But if the pope be thus pronounced the antichrist, and the church he presides over antichristian, where, it may be asked, will the true church of Christ be found? Must we suppose it to be limited to the narrow bounds of the reformed churches, or to those who have suffered death by popish hands for the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus? On this narrow-minded sentiment, Bishop Murdoch, in his lectures lately published, would fain have it, that Protestants are driven, and boasts, not over-wisely, as will appear, of the comparative amplitude of his church, as an argument in its favour against Protestants. But of what value is the argument in the light he applies it? It is plainly of greater force in the hands of Deists against Christianity itself, than it is in his hands against the churches of the reformation; for the Roman Catholic church does not bear so great a proportion to the heathen world, as the reformed churches bear to her. Then in another view, the mournful and mysterious fact on which it rests, is of no avail either to infidel or to papist. Not to the infidel, for in truth it robs him of the argument with which this popish bishop would furnish him, and adds another to the many evidences of the truth of the gospel. This all

but universal apostasy, however to be explained, was yet foretold from the beginning ; and having come to pass in all particulars, as was foretold, the proof is decisive that the Spirit who spake of it is the Spirit of truth—the Spirit of God. Nor will the boasted universality of his church avail this bishop or his cause, more than the infidel. In truth it only serves to fix more indelibly upon his church the brand of that apostasy, and upon the pope the mark of that apostate power of whom it was predicted, that he should prevail and prosper—to whom the kings of the earth should agree to give their strength, and into whose hand the saints of God should be given, that he should make war upon them, and overcome them, until the days of indignation should be fulfilled.

For the times of antichrist are determined. His power shall be brought down to the dust, and the guilty agents of his purposes shall awfully perish. “ He shall reign, for a time, and times, and the dividing of time ;” Jerusalem, or the true church, during the same period, being trodden down of the Gentiles ; that is, corrupted and oppressed by pagan idolatry and antichristian persecutions. “ But at the time of the end, the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion.” The Lord at his coming “ shall consume him with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy him with the brightness of his coming.” I enter not here into any question respecting the date of these events, which I confess myself unable to ascertain. But there is no obscurity left over the doom of antichrist ; and we cannot doubt but that the corrupt system in which his power is embodied, must in due time fall under it. Already has the church seen the breaking up of the popish power. At the era of the Reformation, as the word of prophecy fore-

told, the third part of the idolatrous city fell ; and it fell, as it is said antichrist shall fall, “ by the Spirit of Christ’s mouth,” by the preaching of his word, which is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword. Before this spiritual weapon the power of error is unable to stand. When the gospel is faithfully and powerfully preached, popery withers and consumes away. The breath of Christ’s mouth, which carries life and fruitfulness over the fields of his spiritual heritage, carries the blight of death with it, as it sweeps over the fields in which have been sown the tares of antichristian error. The destruction which is decreed, and which has begun, will, doubtless, be consummated in its time. For aught I know, there may be truth in the apprehensions of certain students of prophecy, that he shall have a time of reviving before he is finally overthrown. But if so, his triumphing shall be short ; and as sure as popish Rome is the mystic Babylon, who hath made the nations to drink of the cup of her fornications, the time draws on when the voice of the mighty angel shall be heard, crying, “ *Babylon is fallen, is fallen !*” followed by the voice of a triumphant church, crying, “ *Alleluia !* salvation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God ; for true and righteous are his judgments ; for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said Alleluia ! And her smoke rose up for ever and ever.”—*Sermon by Rev. J. Henderson on Popery the Antichrist of Scripture. See Lectures on Popery, delivered in Glasgow, 1836.*

PART IV.

MISCELLANEOUS SELECTIONS ON THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"THE TRUE TOUCHSTONE OF A CHURCH MUST BE THE PURITY OF HER DOCTRINE
AND THE CONFORMITY OF HER FAITH WITH THAT WHICH CHRIST AND HIS
APOSTLES TAUGHT."—BISHOP BURNET'S VINDICATION OF THE ORDINATIONS OF
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

PART IV.

MISCELLANEOUS SELECTIONS ON THE

CHURCH OF ROME.

(117.) — Col. ii. 19. *And not holding the head.* Here, the worshipping of angels is declared to be a renouncing of Christ, as Governor, Saviour, and Mediator ; consequently, a renouncing of all the benefits of his government and mediation. The same may be said of the worshipping of saints : for, though they be not mentioned in this passage, the arguments by which the worship of angels is condemned, conclude equally against the worship of saints. Besides, an object of worship ought to be both omniscient, and everywhere present, which neither angels nor saints are.—The Apostle's exhortation in this verse is a good caution to us, to beware of refinements in Christianity, which have any tendency to derogate from the authority, office, and honour of Christ as head of the Church.—*Dr. Macknight on the Epistles.*

(118.) — . . . The Church is a society of Christians united in the same faith, for worshipping of God jointly. And another definition of a Church cannot be proved from Scripture ; for the Church being called

the body of Christ, its union with him as its Head is held forth by the Apostle in these words, Col. ii. 19, — *The head Christ, from whom the whole body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.* From which words we see what constitutes a man a member of the *true Church* ; which is, first, his union to Christ as his Head, together with a dependance on him for growth and nutriture ; and next, his being knit to all others who are thus united to Christ ; which is first, the inward union of Divine charity, by which he loves all who cleave to Christ as their Head ; and next, his associating himself with them in outward visible acts of worship, which every Christian is bound to do, with all that worship God in spirit and truth. But if a society of Christians do visibly swerve from Christ in many great and signal contradictions to the honour due to his person, and to the obedience due to his laws, and do grossly adulterate the worship, so that communion cannot be had with that Church, without departing from the head Christ, then it can be no departing from the Church to adhere to Christ and his true worship, and to separate from the corruptions which are brought in upon the Christian religion. If then it appear that the Church of Rome hath departed from the truth and simplicity of the Gospel, in so many great and main points, those who attempted the reforming her to her first purity, and finding that not to be hoped for, did unite among themselves for serving and worshipping God aright, cannot be charged with separation from the true Church.

But by that cruel tenet of theirs, they breed up all their children in the greatest uncharitableness imaginable, condemning all who cannot believe their strange doctrines, or concur in their unhallowed wor-

ship. Thus they are the schismatics who have departed from the true church, and who force from their communion all who adhere to it : but this cruelty rests not in uncharitable censures, but hath extended itself to as much bloody and barbarous rage as ever sprung from hell ; for all the cruelty of the heathen persecutors cannot match the practices of her that hath been so often *drunk with the blood of saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus*. What enraged cruelty appeared against the poor Waldenses, for the separating from their corruptions ! How many of all sexes and ages were cruelly butchered down by the procurement of the rulers of that church ! And because the Albigenes lived under the protection of princes that favoured them, how did the popes depose their princes, and instigate other ambitious invaders to seize on their dominions ! which to effectuate, a crusade was proclaimed, that had been formerly practised against the enemies of the Christian faith, and heaven was promised to such as went against these poor innocents ; whereupon they were killed by thousands, without all mercy. Never was there any who had the zeal or honesty, in these dark ages, to witness against the apostasy of the Church, but the pope and clergy used all means to get his zeal rewarded with a fagot. And when the time of reformation came, with what rage and spite did the pope, by his letters and legates, instigate all the princes of Europe to cruelty against them ! But as these things were not done in corners, so they are still so fresh in our remembrance, by the copious accounts we have of them, that I need not tell what arts the popes and other ecclesiastics used to set all Germany on fire on this account : nor need I tell the cruelty was exercised in the Netherlands in Charles the Fifth's time, in which more

than a hundred thousand are said by Grotius, to have been butchered on account of religion. And in his son Philip's time, the Duke of Alba did, in a short time, cut down thirty-six thousand. Nor need I tell the cruelties were practised in France for about forty years together; nor of that treacherous massacre, wherein there was an equal mixture of perfidy and cruelty, which, for all that, was entertained at Rome with great joy and applauses. It will be also needless to tell of their cruelty in England in Queen Mary's days which was chiefly managed by the churchmen. And many are yet alive, who remember what enraged cruelty appeared in our neighbour-island against all our religion, which did not only flow from the fury of an oppressed people, but they were trained, encouraged, and warranted to it by their priests, and the nuncio who came afterwards among them, discovered who was the spring of all their motions. Shall I to this add all the private assassinations committed on that account, which were not only practised, but justified? I might here congest many instances, brother murdering brother on the account of religion. Neither is Clement, a Dominican, his murdering Henry the Third, nor Chaslet's attempt, nor Ravillac's fact on Henry the Fourth, forgotten. Queen Elizabeth's life is full of these attempts; and the blackest of them all was the gunpowder treason. All which are to be charged on that church, because the doctrine of murdering heretic princes was taught, licensed, printed, and yet not condemned in it. From these hints we may guess how much of the lowly, meek, and charitable spirit is to be found with them. But should I to this add the horrid cruelties exercised in these massacres, I should be almost past belief, had I not undeniable historians for verifying it; but the

mildest of them being to be burned alive, we may guess what the more savage have done by their tortures and lingering deaths. Next shall I mention their courts of inquisition which have been among them, in the hands of churchmen, from the days of their pretended St. Dominick, whose order have been the great instruments of the cruelties of that church, and whose procedure being tied to no forms of equity or justice, is as unjust as unmerciful; persons being haled to their black courts upon bare suspicions or secret informations, without leading of proofs against them, are by torture examined, not only of their own opinions, but of all that are known to them; whose testimony, though drawn from them by cruel torture, will bring the same tortures on all they delate; neither is there any mercy for any whom this court declares heretic, but the civil magistrate must condemn them to the fire. Now what man that considers the meekness of Christ, and the evangelical spirit, can think that church the spouse of Christ, that hath rioted it with such savage rage against thousands of persons, for no other crime, but because they adhered firmly to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and would not consent or concur with these signal and palpable corruptions with which they have adulterated it.

. . . Easiness and gentleness are by Christ applied to his yoke, laws, and burden; and whatever opposition or trouble they may give to the carnal man by mortifying his lusts and contradicting all his inordinate and unlimited desires, yet by the rational faculties and powers they are both easily understood and practised. Indeed, religion lies in few things, and its chief work is the reforming and purifying the inward man, where it mainly dwells and exerts its force and virtue; but these who have added so much, both to be believed

and done, beyond what our Lord prescribed, as they accuse his unfaithfulness, so bring unsupportable burdens on the consciences of Christians. These, therefore, who lead out the mind, by presenting a great many foreign objects to it, do introduce superannuated Judaism, instead of that liberty Christ brought with him into the world. But shall I number up here all the impositions of that church, whose numbers are great as well as their nature grievous? for it is a study to know them all: but what a pain must it be to perform them! It is a work which will take up a great deal of time to understand the rubrics of their missals, breviaries, rituals, and pontificals. In a word, they have left the purity and simplicity of religion, and set up instead of it a lifeless heap of ordinances, which must oppress, but cannot relieve the consciences of their disciples.—*Bishop Burnet. See Enchir. Theol. Anti-Romanum, Vol. iii. p. 44. 59.*

(119.) Col. ii. 19.—*And not holding the Head, &c.* This is that capital crime of seducers; whilst they would have angels to be worshipped, they proceed to diminish the dignity of Christ; for they take away from him the prerogative of the Head. *They hold not the Head*, because they themselves neither rightly judge of the virtue and sufficiency of this Head, nor preach it to others. For Christ *the God-man*, is the Head of the Church. If they acknowledged him to be *God*, they would seek from him alone grace and salvation; if to be *man*, they would not solicit angels or other men to intercede with God for them; since they have Christ our elder brother, sitting continually at the right hand of God. Although, therefore, as far as words go, they concede the name of the Head of

the Church to Christ, yet they take away from him the reality and the prerogative itself of the Head, whilst they hope more easily to obtain mercy, grace, righteousness and remission of sins by the mediation of saints or angels, than of Christ; and, therefore, they offer the worship of invocation to them more frequently and more earnestly than to Christ.¹

Hence we may infer,

1. The primary object of Satan is, by seducers, who are his ministers, to withdraw Christians from Christ the Head, and to persuade them to rest for salvation upon other aids, not upon Christ alone.

2. They who feel concern for their salvation ought never to turn their eyes from their Head: for if they

¹ As it is not necessary there should be a formal abjuration of Christianity in order to constitute an apostasy from the faith, (see No. 9,) so, neither is it requisite there should be a prohibition of *all* matrimony, to justify the application of that passage in St. Paul's first Epistle to Timothy—"forbidding to marry," to the Church of Rome. For the same reason also, it is not necessary there should be a *total* rejection of Christ as a Mediator, to warrant the charge against the Church of Rome of "*not holding the Head.*" It is sufficient if other mediators are set up on his throne; he is thus virtually thrust from it, and that honour given to another which is due to him alone. Christ will be our *only* Mediator, or *no* Mediator at all, for he will not share this office with another. It is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity, and cannot be too often insisted upon, that Christ is the *only* Mediator between God and man; as Bishop Newton observes, 'the denial of such an essential part may be as properly called *apostasy*, as if we were to renounce the whole Christian faith and worship. It is renouncing them in effect, and not treating and regarding God as God, or Christ as Christ.' When the Church of Rome, therefore, sets up a crowd of mediators besides Christ, and then says she believes in him as the only Mediator between God and man, she fulfils another predicted mark of the papacy; namely, 'speaking lies in hypocrisy.'—EDITOR.

are plucked away from him by the wiles of seducers, there is an end of salvation.

3. Christians are plucked away, and do not hold the Head, whenever they embrace new doctrines, new worship, new means of salvation, never prescribed or delivered by Christ and his apostles. *If any man teach any other doctrine, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, he is proud, knowing nothing.*—1 Tim. vi. 3, 4. Thus far concerning the crime of seducers, viz. that *they do not hold the Head*; by which argument the apostle proves that they are to be rejected.

Now, if it be inquired, why they are to be avoided who hold not the Head, or why it is so necessary for us to adhere to the Head; the apostle shews it from the effects which flow from the Head, and the fruit of the same; which are comprehended in these words. *From which all the body by joints &c.*

. . . To adhere to the Roman Pontiff as a visible head, does not constitute a true member of the church; but to adhere to Christ the Head. Therefore, hypocrites, and the ungodly are not true members of the Catholic Church, to whatever visible church they may join themselves, unless by the joints of the spirit and of faith they are united to Christ.

. . . The Papists err, who will have the church to draw the doctrine of salvation, not alone from Christ, the Head, but from human traditions; who will have her also to receive the matter of salvation, viz. holiness, merit, and satisfactions, not from Christ alone, and the passion of Christ, but from angels, from saints, and the sufferings of saints. If this be true, this statement of the apostle is not true, that his whole body hath *nourishment ministered*, i. e. is abundantly supplied and furnished for the attainment of salvation by Christ the

Head. Thus much concerning the first effect, which is obtained by those who cleave to Christ the Head. . . . The faith or piety of a Christian man is not increased when his mind is filled with human traditions and will-worship; because those things are not from the spirit, but from the empty wind of ignorance and pride.

Hence we learn not to be deceived by that incongruous mass of opinions of the Romish Church. That kingdom of the pope may be increased, extended, and spread in every part of the earth; yet it is not proved to be the body of Christ.

Why? Because it is increased by an external increase of splendour and temporal things; it is increased by a heap of traditions, and by an accession of many superstitions; not by the true knowledge of God, not by sincere piety; in a word, it is not *the increase of God*.—*Bishop Davenant on Colossians. Translated by Rev. J. Allport. Vol. i. p. 511.*

(120.)—... This is the very essence of Christian worship, to worship the one true God through the one true Christ; and to worship any other God or any other mediator, is apostasy and rebellion against God and against Christ. It is as St. Paul saith (Col. ii. 19.) *not holding the Head*, but depending upon other heads: &c.—*Bishop Newton on the Prophecies.*

(121.)—Pride is at the bottom of a great many errors and corruptions, and even of many evil practices, which have a great shew and appearance of humility. They who do so, do *not hold the Head*. They did in effect, disclaim Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man. It is the highest disparagement to

Christ, who is the Head of the church, for any of the members of it to make use of any intercessors with God but him. When men let go their hold of Christ, they catch at that which is next them, and will stand them in no stead.—*Henry's Commentary*. Col. ii. 19.

(122.)—... As the Lord's Supper is a seal of our conjunction one with another and with Christ our Head, so is it an evidence of our disjunction from idolaters, binding us to disavow all communion with them in their false worship. And, indeed, the one must necessarily follow upon the other, considering the nature of this heinous sin of idolatry is such that it can no ways stand with the fellowship which a Christian man ought to have both with the Head and with the body of the church. To this purpose in the sixth of the second to the Corinthians we read thus: *What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you: and in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians, Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed by his fleshly mind, and not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.* In which words the apostle sheweth unto us that such as, under pretence of humility, were drawn to the worshipping of angels, did not hold the Head, and consequently could not re-

tain communion with the *body*, which receiveth its whole growth from thence. Answerably whereunto the fathers assembled out of divers provinces of Asia in the Synod held at Laodicea, not far from the Colossians, did solemnly conclude, that “ Christians ought not to forsake the church of God, and go and invoke angels,” and pronounced an *anathema* against any that should be found to do so, because they say, “ he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and given himself to idolatry ;” declaring plainly, that by this idolatrous invocation of angels a discession was made both from *the church of God*, as they note in the beginning and from *Christ the Head of the Church*, as they observe in the end of their canon. —*Archbishop Usher's Sermon preached before the House of Commons.*—1620.

(123.)—Col. ii. 18, 19. Our Apostle, having warned the Colossians against the errors of the judaizing teachers, comes next to warn them against the practice of the paganizing Christians, who were directed by their guides to worship the angels, covering their error with a plausible shew of humility, pretending it was presumptuous to go to God immediately without the mediation of those excellent creatures ; but this the Apostle tells them was a bold *intruding into things* they knew nothing of, God having neither revealed nor taught any such thing ; and argued that they were *vainly puffed up* with the foolish imagination of their own *fleshly minds*. Next he shews, that these angel-worshippers do not acknowledge Christ for the head of the Church while they apply themselves to angels as mediators ; whereas he alone discharges the office of the head, completely giving life and growth to his

whole church, and to every member thereof ; which members being furnished with spiritual life from him, and knit to him and one another by the joints and bands of charity and other graces, they grow and increase with such an increase of holiness as is from God, and tends to his glory. Note here, 1. That the nature of man is prone, extremely prone to idolatry and false worship. 2. That it is as really idolatry to worship an angel, as it is to worship a worm ; for divine worship is only due to a divine person. Note, 3. That it is a renouncing of Christ, to make use of angels or any other mediator, besides Christ, unto the Father ; *not holding the Head*. . . . Note, 4. That it is usual for idolaters, and false worshippers to cover themselves with a more than ordinary shew of humility ; let none beguile you in a voluntary humility. True it is, that all duties of worship ought to be voluntary, as voluntary is opposed to constrained ; but they must not be voluntary, as voluntary is opposed to instituted or appointed ; God doth no more approve of that worship we give him according to our will, than he doth approve of our neglect of that which is according to his own will. But man, vain man, likes any way of worshipping God which is of his own framing, much better than that which is of God's own appointing.—*Burkitt on the New Testament in loco*.

(124.)—How dreadfully do the transactions of the visible Church illustrate the doctrine of man's depravity ! The blasphemies and impious abrogations of the divine laws to make way for man's inventions ; *the denying of the Head*, in order to worship creatures ; the most diabolical pride united with voluntary humility ; the most carnal and abandoned conduct, cloaked

under the appearance of the greatest mortification ; the most lavish profusion joined with the most extreme avarice and extortion, have been found in the greatest degree, among the rulers of the *professedly* Christian Church ! but these are Antichristian abuses, which will soon come to an end, however men may now practise and prosper in them.—*Scott's Commentary*, Dan. xi. 39.

(125.)—By thus exalting angels to the office of mediators, and worshipping them in that capacity, they especially dishonoured Christ—the “One Mediator between God and man,” to whom “as God manifested in the flesh,” such worship ought to be appropriated. *They did not adhere to Christ the Head and sole Mediator between God and man*, or maintain communion with him, but in fact they departed from the grand principles of the Gospel by choosing and worshipping other mediators ; and as no sinner can approach God, or be accepted, but in and by Christ ; so this error tended directly to ruin their souls.—*Ibid.* Col. ii. 18, 19.

(126.)—In the former part of the volume, Gregory I. of Rome, and the English Christians, will be found objects deserving our serious attention. Nor should we be prejudiced against the real Church, because she then wore a Roman garb. Undoubtedly she was by this means much defiled with superstition ; for that was as much the predominant evil of those times, as profaneness is of our own. The last-mentioned evil admits of no coalition with Christian holiness ; but superstition, to a certain degree, may co-exist with

the spirit of the Gospel. When that degree is exceeded, and *general idolatry* takes place, the system then becomes *too corrupt to deserve the name of the Church of Christ*. I have marked this limit to the best of my judgment in the course of this History, have exhibited the MAN OF SIN matured in all his gigantic horrors, and from that epocha I despair of discovering the Church in the collective body of nominal Christians. Every Reader will observe the various features of Antichrist described in this volume, and some may perhaps be enabled to form a more distinct and adequate conception of the nature of Popery, than they had before acquired. Leaving therefore the general Church of Rome, after she had *entirely ceased to HOLD THE HEAD*, I either travel with faithful missionaries into regions of heathenism, and describe the propagation of the Gospel in scenes altogether new, or dwell with circumstantial exactness on the lives and writings of some particular individuals, in whom the Spirit of God maintained the power of godliness while they remained in Babylon.—*Milner's Church History*, Vol. III. Preface.

(127.)— . . . It was reserved to Innocent the Third, than whom no pope ever possessed more ambition, to institute the Inquisition; and the Waldenses were the first objects of its cruelty. He authorized certain monks to frame the process of that court, and to deliver the supposed heretics to the secular power. The beginning of the thirteenth century saw thousands of persons hanged or burned by these diabolical devices, whose sole crime was, that they trusted only in Jesus Christ for salvation, and renounced all the vain hopes of self-righteous idolatry and superstition.

Whoever has attended closely to the subjects of the two Epistles to the Colossians and the Galatians, and has penetrated the meaning of the Apostle, sees the great duty of **HOLDING THE HEAD**, and of resting for justification by faith on Jesus Christ alone, inculcated throughout them as the predominant precept of Christianity, in opposition to the rudiments of the world, to philosophy and vain deceit, to will-worship, to all dependence for our happiness on human works and devices of whatever kind. Such a person sees what is genuine Protestantism, as contrasted to genuine Popery; and of course, he is convinced, that the difference is not merely verbal or frivolous, but that there is *a perfect opposition in the two plans*; and such as admits of no coalition or union; and that therefore the true way of withstanding the devices of Satan, is to be faithful to the great doctrine of justification, "only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not by our own works or deservings." Hence the very foundation of false religion is overthrown; hence troubled consciences obtain solid peace: and faith, working by love, leads men into the very spirit of Christianity, while it comforts their hearts, and stablishes them in every good work.¹—*Ibid.* p. 485.

(128.) My Lord, if the public prints have faithfully reported your speech in moving the second reading of

¹ The foregoing passages from Milner's Church History deserve to be attentively considered. Milner was too sound a theologian, and too consistent a Protestant, to view the Church of Rome in the light of a true church, after she had ceased to "HOLD THE HEAD," and had become apostate and idolatrous.

Errors upon this subject are productive of the most serious

the *Irish Church Bill*, your lordship is represented to have said, that the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are fundamentally the same with those of the Church of England. A Roman Catholic writer, in his project for the re-establishment of popery in Ireland, has lately asserted, that 'if we except extreme unction, the Protestants admit *all the other leading rites* of the Catholic Church,' leaving his uninformed readers to suppose, that excepting the article of extreme unction, there is very little difference between the Protestant and Roman Churches in their religious tenets. This is an old stratagem of the Roman Church for the removal of Protestant prepossessions against her communion, and apprehensions of danger from any association with it. This favourable aspect towards the Church of Rome is a great and fatal delusion, as we unhappily know too well from its influence on the legislature in 1829, when it was contended that the admission of papists into parliament would tranquillise Ireland,—strengthen the Church of England, and give satisfaction to all parties. The same favourable feeling towards the Church of Rome seems to have possessed your lordship's mind, when you confidently asserted,

consequences. It is not a matter of indifference whether we believe the Church of Rome to be true or otherwise, for our conduct towards Romanists will be regulated, more or less, by the opinions which we entertain respecting their church. If we believe the Church of Rome to be a true Church of Christ, we are not likely to warn her members of the danger of remaining in her communion, or to use any strenuous efforts for their conversion. Nor, indeed, is it reasonable to suppose such efforts would prove effectual if they were made. It is to little purpose that we call upon men to come out of a church, if, at the same time, we pronounce that church to be true, apostolic, and Christian;—common sense might point out the folly and inconsistency of such conduct.—[EDITOR.]

that fundamentally her doctrines were the same with those of the Church of England. But, my lord, the doctrines of the Roman Church are so far from being fundamentally the same with those of our Church, that *they are fundamentally and essentially opposed to them, and subversive of them.* The Church of Rome has not left us at a loss to know, what are the *fundamental* articles of her creed. Your lordship will, I doubt not, readily admit, that all doctrines are so to be denominated in both churches, which are held in each to be necessary to salvation. Such are the doctrines which are contained in the creed, commonly called Pope Pius's Creed, which at once presents this broad difference between the Church of Rome and all other churches,—that all who deny her doctrines, are pronounced by her to be accursed. In that creed are contained the following articles of her faith, without the belief of which she declares that no one can be saved : the supremacy of the pope and of his church,—transubstantiation,—the sacrifice of the mass,—the worship of saints,—the veneration of images and relics,—purgatory,—penance for the remission of sins,—seven sacraments, &c.

These articles of Pope Pius's Creed, are fundamental doctrines of the Church of Rome, and *not* of the Church of England, but were rejected by her three centuries ago as idolatrous, impious, and heretical. And so utterly at variance are they with the doctrines of our church, that *they are subversive of our whole Protestant Establishment.* Yet on the supposed approximation of the two churches was founded much of that fatal delusion which led to the extinction of the purely Protestant character of the British legislature, by the admission of papists into the great council of the nation. In consequence of this recent anomaly in

our constitution, and the utter forgetfulness of the anti-British as well as anti-protestant spirit of popery, great encouragement has been given to it in Ireland, to the great detriment of the Established Church, and of the true profession of the Gospel.—*Bishop Burgess's Letter to Lord Melbourne*, 1835, p. 1—4.

(129.) There are Protestants who maintain publicly that the Church of Rome at the present day, is sound in the fundamental articles of religion, and who recommend a union between her and the Protestant Church of England, though the fundamental doctrinal articles of the latter, are as much opposed to those of the former as human language can make them; and were indeed originally intended to exhibit a standard directly opposed to the doctrinal errors of Rome. . . .

When we convict the Church of Rome of gross errors in doctrine, and, if possible, of grosser immoralities in practice, instead of clearing herself of what is thus brought home to her, she shelters herself under Christ's promise to his spiritual body, that the gates of hell should never prevail against it; but the Church of Rome has never been able to show that this applied to her, any more than to the church in Corinth, or the churches in Galatia. . . . It rests with papists to produce the patent, under the broad seal of heaven, which invests their church with the privilege of indefectability; and until they can produce this, we must be allowed to believe that she is as liable to corruption, as any other church that is acknowledged to have become corrupt. . . . We must also be allowed to believe the testimony of our own senses, when we read the blasphemous doctrines which are taught, and witness the idolatries which are practised by papists

of the present day, which inevitably lead us to the conclusion, that she is the most corrupt communion that ever appeared in the world, under the much-abused name of Christian.—*The Protestant*, vol. iii. p. 214.

(130.) *Of the fundamental difference between the Churches of England and Rome, in respect to Articles of Faith, &c.*

In taking a comparative view of the churches of England and Rome, the doctrines, respectively maintained by the two churches, present themselves as the object of primary consideration. The truth or falsehood of a religion is the truth or falsehood of its *doctrines*: for alterations may be made, both in the ceremonies of a church, and in the authority of a church, without affecting the truth of the religion, which it professes. But that we may be enabled to judge of the truth or falsehood of doctrines, we must previously know on what foundations they are built. In the first place then we must inquire into the fundamental difference between the two churches, in respect to their doctrines; and when it has been proved that the two churches *are fundamentally distinct*, we must in the next place inquire, whether the foundation, on which the Church of Rome has built, (independently of the foundation common to both churches) is composed of solid, or of sandy materials. The decision of this question will enable us to judge, whether the *doctrines* which distinguish the Church of Rome from the Church of England, are true or false. . . .

In the first place then let us endeavour to prove that the two churches, in respect of doctrines, *are fundamentally distinct*. For this purpose, it is neces-

sary to show, not only that they differ in many single articles of faith, but that the faith of the one is founded on a different basis from the faith of the other ; or (to change the metaphor) that the sources, from which the two churches derive their articles of faith, are not the same. If this be true, there is no agreement, either in church-authority, or in church-ceremonies which can remove that inherent distinction. Not, that they do agree in either of these respects. . . .

That there is one source of Christian faith, which is common to the two churches, may be readily granted : for the authority of the Bible, however variously *interpreted*, is admitted by Christians of every description. But if the Bible is the *sole* fountain of Christian faith to the Church of England, and *not* the sole fountain of Christian faith to the Church of Rome, the authority admitted by the latter, in addition to the authority of the Bible, must constitute an *essential difference* between the two churches.—*Bishop Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome*. 1816. p. 1—3.

(131.) . . . If men will profess to believe but in one God, and yet worship thousands; if they will read over the Second Commandment, and nevertheless both make and bow down before graven images in despite of it; if whilst they acknowledge Christ to have instituted the blessed eucharist in both kinds, they command it to be administered but in one; and pray in an unknown tongue, though St. Paul has spent almost a whole chapter to show the folly and unreasonableness of it;—*these* are errors in which I am not concerned, and though I should be unwilling, even here, at all adventures to pronounce any sentence against the *men*,

yet I must needs say, *that* religion cannot be very sound which stands corrupted with so many and such *fundamental* abuses. And this makes the difference between those *errors*, for which we separate from the Church of Rome, and those *controversies* which sometimes arise among Protestants themselves. The *former* are in matters of the *greatest consequence*, such as tend directly to overthrow the *integrity of faith*, and the *purity of our worship*; and therefore such as in their own nature are destructive of the very *essentials* of Christianity. Whereas *our* differences do not at all concern the *foundations* either of *faith* or *worship*, and are therefore such in which good men, if they be otherwise diligent and sincere in their inquiry, may differ, without any prejudice, or any just reflection upon the truth of their common profession.—*Archbishop Wake*.

(132.)—I perceive some readers have unheedily and unjustly stumbled at this proposition, as if I had herein slighted the differences betwixt us and the Roman Church: from which I am so far, as that I have ever professed to hold them to be on their parts, no less than *damnable errors*; and such as by consequence do *raze the foundation*.—*Bishop Hall's Works*, Vol. ix. p. 339. Ed. 1808.

(133.)—Bishop Mant in reply to Lord Melbourne's assertion, that "the Roman Catholics in all the *fundamentals* of Christianity agree with Protestants," makes the following remarks: . . . "I venture to express a hope, that if your Lordship shall have honoured with your perusal the contents of these pages, being, as

they are, little more than transcripts from authoritative declarations, they will have wrought a change in the opinion, which you have been reported to have expressed, concerning the agreement of the two Churches, in all the fundamentals of Christianity. For, if I do not greatly deceive myself, a manifest disagreement has been shown—the grounds of the disagreement your Lordship will readily see it has not been my object to set forth, but my business has been limited to the more humble task of proving and exemplifying the disagreement—and such disagreement, I presume has been incontrovertibly shown to exist, with respect to the rule of faith ; to the meritorious cause of man's salvation ; the number of the sacraments ; the effect of baptism on original sin ; transubstantiation, or the change of the sacramental bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ ; the nature of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper ; the adoration of the sacrament ; the reservation of the consecrated bread and wine ; the preparation of communicants ; the giving of the cup to the laity ; the language of ministration ; the sacrifice of masses ; solitary masses by the priest ; purgatory, indulgences, the worshipping and adoration of images and reliques, and the invocation of saints ; the Virgin Mary's exemption from sin ; the celibacy of the clergy, the infallibility and dominion of the Church of Rome. Of these numerous articles, my Lord, more might be mentioned, if needed ; but your Lordship will probably deem these sufficient in number ; and of all these I venture to anticipate, that your Lordship will not dissent from the assertion, that there is scarcely any, perhaps not one, that ought not to be ranked among "*the fundamentals* of Christianity." And the least that can be said upon this subject is,

that a great, a very great change indeed, must have been produced in the professions of Christian faith, as now respectively sanctioned by the Churches of Rome and of England, before they can be justly represented as agreeing in all the fundamentals of their religion."

—*Letter to Lord Melbourne, by the Bishop of Down and Connor*, p. 30.

(134.)—Bishop Mant after citing some of the Articles contained in Pope Pius's Appendix to the Nicene Creed, observes :—" These are the Articles of ' the true Catholick Faith out of which no one can be saved,' which the Romanist ' professes that he truly holds; which he promises, vows, and swears, that he will most constantly hold and profess, whole and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of his life; and that he will procure, as far as lies in his power, that the same shall be held, taught and preached, by those who are under him, and by those the care of whom shall belong to him, by virtue of his office.' But whether ' this true Catholic Faith,' *falsely so called*—whether this *corrupt Roman Faith*, to describe it more correctly—be agreeable to Holy Scripture; or rather, that it is *diametrically opposed* to Holy Scripture; will probably have sufficiently appeared from the remarks subjoined to each of the foregoing Articles. A conviction of this opposition, in the minds of our Reformers of the sixteenth century, led to the separation between the Churches of England and of Rome. The same conviction must lead at all times to a similar result, with those who regard Holy Scripture as their only rule of faith; for such persons cannot but condemn the Romish doctrines as erroneous and false; and cannot hold communion with a church

which pronounces a belief of them as necessary to salvation, which demands a profession of them from all Christians, and imposes creeds and oaths wherein they are affirmed, as terms of her communion."—*Romanism and Holy Scripture compared, by Bishop Mant, p. 72.*

(135.)—You (Mr. Charles Butler) wish "that the Protestants and Romanists would abstain from contention, and unite in defence of our common Christianity." We dare not abstain from the contention. The tares are mingled with the wheat, and though both must grow together till the harvest, the Protestant labourer must encourage the one, and guard against the other. Scarcely is our Christianity common. The Scriptures which teach us are different; for you receive, as inspired, the apocryphal books. Our objects of worship are different, for you place on the throne of God the virgin, the saints, and the angels. Our seals of faith are different; for you have elevated useful, or doubtful institutions, to the rank of sacraments. Our modes of discipline are different; for we reject the arbitrary fastings, the priest-inflicted penance, the private confession, and the capricious absolution. The *essentials* and the *non-essentials* of our faith, *all, all are different.* We cannot walk together unless we be agreed; we cannot agree unless one be reformed.—*Townsend's Accusations of History against the Church of Rome, p. 196.*

(136.)—But now herein standeth the controversy: Whether all men do justly arrogate to themselves the Holy Ghost or no? The bishops of Rome have for a long time made a sore challenge thereunto, reasoning

for themselves after this sort. The Holy Ghost say they, was promised to the Church, and never forsaketh the Church. But we are the chief heads, and the principal part of the Church : therefore we have the Holy Ghost for ever ; and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities, and oracles of the Holy Ghost.

That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you, first, what the true Church of Christ is ; and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith, to discern how well they agree together.

The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known : Pure and sound doctrine ; the sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution ; and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient fathers ; so that none may justly find fault therewith.

Now, if you will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd, you shall well perceive the state thereof to be *so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more.* For, *neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,* retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus ; neither yet do they order the sacraments, or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as he did at first institute and ordain them : but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and

changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they may seem to be converted into a new guise.

. . . To be short, look what our Saviour Christ pronounced of the Scribes and Pharisees in the Gospel; the same may be boldly and with safe conscience pronounced of the bishops of Rome; namely, that they have forsaken, and daily do forsake, the commandments of God, to erect and set up their own constitutions. Which thing being true, as all they which have any light of God's word must needs confess, we may well conclude, according to the rule of Augustine, that the bishops of Rome and their adherents *are not the true Church of Christ*, much less then to be taken as chief heads and rulers of the same. Whosoever, saith he, do dissent from the Scriptures concerning the head, although they be found in all places where the church is appointed, yet are they not in the church: a plain place concluding directly against the Church of Rome.—*Homily XXVIII. Part 2.*

(137.)—God grant all us, the king's highness' faithful and true subjects, to feed of the sweet and savoury bread of God's own word; and as Christ commanded, to eschew all our Pharisaical and Papistical leaven of man's feigned religion; which, although it were before God most abominable, and contrary to God's commandments, and Christ's pure religion, yet it was praised to be a most godly life, and highest state of perfection; as though a man might be more godly, and more perfect, by keeping the rules, traditions, and professions of men, than by keeping the holy commandments of God. And briefly to pass over the *un-godly* and *counterfeit* religion, let us rehearse some

other kinds of Papistical superstitions and abuses.*. . .
—*Homily V. Part 3.*

* The foregoing extracts from the Homilies clearly prove, if words have any meaning in them, that the Church of England does not view the Church of Rome in the light of a true and apostolic church. She distinctly affirms that the Church of Rome is *not* a true church, and repudiates her religion as *ungodly* and *counterfeit*. The argument derived from Romish ordination being recognized as valid, proves nothing to the purpose for which it is advanced. It only serves to show that the doctrine and discipline of our Established Church in this, as in several other instances, are at variance with each other. If we wish to know the real sentiments of the Church of England on this disputed point, we must go to her authorized formularies, and not draw inferences from her defective practice. Bishop Burnet observes, "if I could justify all our practices, as well as I can do our principles, there were no grounds to fear hurt from all the cavils of mortals."—*See Ench. Theol. Anti-Romanum*, vol. iii. p. 68.

We are sometimes reminded that men distinguished for their piety and learning have acknowledged the Church of Rome to be a true Church. They may have done so, but, where are their *arguments*? These are so puerile that even their own friends are lothe to produce them; they trust rather to the influence of their names, than the force of their reasoning.

The same thing applies to the arguments of those who deny that Antichrist has his seat in the Church of Rome. Bishop Hurd, who has handled this subject in a masterly manner, informs us that the learned Grotius "undertook to prove in form, that *the Pope was not Antichrist*. . . . He bent all the efforts of his wit and learning to discredit and overthrow that doctrine. . . . The issue of his general scheme was what might easily be foreseen: and of his *arguments*, I shall only say thus much, that the Romish writers themselves, for whose use they might seem to be invented, though they continue to object his name to us, are too wise to venture the stress of their cause upon them."

The Rev. T. P. Pantin, in his notes to Bishop Bull's Corruptions of the Church of Rome, mentions that 'Bishop Davenant, who cannot be accused of leaning towards the Roman Church, thus writes to Bishop Hall;—" 'To grant that the Roman Church was and is a true, visible, Christian Church, though in

(138.) . . . Custom sanctions and renders current strange and even ridiculous appellations, but it does

doctrine a false, and in practice an idolatrous church, is a true assertion, and of greater use and necessity in our controversy with papists about the perpetuity of the Christian Church than is understood by those who gainsay it?' Mr. Pantin, however, omits to notice the fact, that Bishop Davenant, in his letter to Bishop Hall, admits 'the Roman Church is no more a true church in respect of Christ, or those due qualities and proper actions which Christ requires, than an arrant whore is a true and loyal wife unto her husband.' Thus it appears that Bishop Davenant considered the Church of Rome to be a true church as it respects its *being* or *existence*, but *not* a true church, as it respects its *qualities* or *actions*. This playing fast and loose with a term is, to use Bishop Davenant's own words, mere trifling, and is perhaps best answered by what that learned Prelate has himself said in reply to the arguments advanced by Bellarmine, when reasoning in a similar manner.

'The Catholic Church,' he observes, 'which is called the body of Christ, consists of such as are truly sanctified and united to Christ by an internal alliance, so that no wicked person, or unbeliever, is a member of this body, solely by the external profession of faith, and participation of the sacraments. We oppose this position to Bellarmine, who, ventures to assert—' *For any one to be called absolutely a member of the true church no internal virtue is required, but only an external profession of faith and communion of the sacraments, and union with the Roman Church.*' Hence he manifestly places among the true members of the body of the Catholic Church, ungodly men, disguised hypocrites, and infidels; provided they abide in outward communion with the Church of Rome.

. . . But the wicked and infidels are not *living members* of the body of Christ, by Bellarmine's own concession, nay he expressly calls them *dead members* in the same chapter; where he moreover adds, 'I say that as it pertains to the design of a member to be a certain part of a living body, a wicked bishop, and a wicked presbyter are dead members, and therefore not true members of the body of Christ.' But now mark the dullness of this disputant. The question proposed in the beginning was, whether wicked men and infidels were true members of the Catholic Church which is the

not therefore follow that they are correct.* . . . The word 'Catholic Church,' properly belongs only to those who believe and teach the whole doctrine of Christ, as revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures. . . . They, therefore, who teach what Christ or his apostles never taught, who either make additions to His doctrines, or who keep back any part of the declared will of God, cannot surely, with any propriety, call themselves Catholics. But the Church of Rome does all this. It teaches "for doctrines the commandments of men," and renders "the commandment of God of none

body of Christ, on account of their outward communion and profession of faith? The Jesuit undertook to defend the affirmative part; and now he is compelled to confess that they are not *living* but *dead members*; that *they are not true members so as to answer the purpose of a member*. But what is neither living, nor true, nor answers the purpose of a member; how will Bellarmine maintain to be nevertheless a true member? Hearken; '*He is not a true member so far as answers the character of a member, but he is a true member as far as regards the character of an instrument.*' THIS IS MERE TRIFLING! For nothing can be understood of which the formal cause is denied, neither does the genus determine the species.

Those whom the church itself would not acknowledge as members or its parts, if it knew what they are, Christ, who knows all things, doth not acknowledge.

. . . The same man is not at the same time a member of Christ, and of the devil: but wicked men are numbered amongst the servants and the children of the devil, John viii. 38—44; therefore they are not to be reckoned among the members of Christ. See Allport's translation of Davenant on the Colossians, ch. i. ver. 18.

That which Bishop Davenant affirms of individuals applies equally to communities: a church cannot be true and false; apostate and apostolic; Christian and Antichristian, at one and the same time.—EDITOR.

* Archdeacon Browne judiciously observes that—'Precision of language is indispensably requisite in every species of controversial writing, and especially in theological controversy.'

effect" by its tradition: for it asserts, that all saving truth is not contained in the Holy Scripture, but partly in the Scripture, and partly in unwritten traditions. It keeps back the revealed will of God, by forbidding its members generally to read the Bible. It withholds the wine from the lay communicants in the sacrament, though Christ ordered it, as well as the bread, to be given to *all*. It adds five sacraments to the two, viz. Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which Christ instituted. By these, and many other erroneous doctrines and practices, the Church of Rome *hath clearly forfeited all title to the name of Catholic.*—*Dialogues between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic, by Rev. S. Hobson, p. 31. Published by Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.*

(139.)—It surely cannot be necessary for a clergyman of the Church of England to apologise, at any time, for bringing forward the real grounds, on which his church found itself compelled to separate from the Church of Rome. This is not, be it remembered, nor can it ever be, one of those cases, in which silence and compromise are consistent with good faith, and may therefore be demanded by charity. No! this, if any, is a vital question. For, if the differences between the two churches be, indeed, as slight, as you and others would represent them, the plain consequence must be (and you, at least will not deny it,) that our separation from you was, and is, schismatical; that the fathers and martyrs of the Reformation were not only in error, but in sin; that they have propagated that sin to us their descendants, and that we cannot too soon retrace our steps, and sue to be re-admitted into the bosom of your church.

: It is plain, therefore, that the ministers of the Church of England must not, and can not, permit it to be believed, that any approximation to the real doctrines of the Church of Rome is regarded by them as even possible. Be we, in charity and mutual forbearance, as conciliating as you will :—too charitable, and too forbearing in things indifferent, we cannot be ; still we must not dissemble, that “ between us and you there is a great gulph fixed ;” which may indeed be passed from either side to the other, but which admits not of any true resting-place being found between them.

. . . So much of management has been successfully employed to distort or disguise the truth, that it is no longer a superfluous task to revive in the members of our own church, a recollection of the real nature of those tenets, from which our forefathers, at the Reformation, were enabled by God’s blessing, to rescue themselves and their descendants. . . .

. . . It is much more manifest that yours is not *the catholic church*, than it is easy to prove that you are, in any legitimate sense, *a church at all*. Many of the wisest and most pious Protestants have denied, in toto, your claim to that title ; and the most that any of us can concede, is, that you are still a branch, though a most tremendously corrupt branch of the catholic church.—*Dr. Philpott’s Letters to Charles Butler, Esq.* p. 5—14.

(140.)— . . . To say either of the Church of Rome or of the Church of England, or of the Greek church, or of any other particular church, of what denomination soever, that it is the catholic or universal church, would be as absurd as to affirm that a part is the whole. And to

be sure, I never meant the Church of Rome to be the catholic church exclusively to all other churches. I am so far from any such meaning that my constant judgment of the Church of Rome hath been, that if she may be allowed still to remain a part or member of the catholic church, *which hath been questioned by some learned men, upon grounds and reasons not very easy to be answered*, yet she is certainly a very unsound and corrupted one, and sadly degenerated from her primitive purity.—*Bishop Bull's Corruptions of the Church of Rome. Published by Christian Knowledge Society, p. 18.*

(141.)—I am so far from ever thinking that salvation is only to be found in unity with her, (the Church of Rome,) that on the contrary, I verily believe they are in great danger of their salvation, who live in her communion; that is, who own her erroneous doctrines, and join in her corrupt worship.—*Ibid. p. 14.*

(142.)—... We have departed from that church which they have made a den of thieves, and in which they have left *nothing sound or like to a church.*—*Bishop Jewel's Answer to Harding.*

(143.)—... It was true that... the Roman Catholic Church was in reality a tottering fabric; but yet, if it was even in its tottering state an extensive one, they ought to be anxious to see it thrown down entirely, for the sake of those who were affected by its influence. If it was in the power of this Society to lessen the

influence and tendency of the Roman catholic mysteries, there could not be a doubt that it was most agreeable in the sight of God. It was his sincere belief that they were opposing a church which was apostate from the truth, and one which was *no longer to be regarded as any part of the Church of Christ*. If he should say any thing which appeared to be harsh or severe against the Roman Catholic Church, he wished to be understood as drawing a wide distinction between those members of it who were deeply imbued with its worst principles, and those who were Roman Catholics in little else than the name.—*Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel's Speech, at a Meeting of the British Reformation Society. May, 1838.*

(144.)—I have said in a previous letter, that the darkest or the most ignorant, or what perhaps, I should have said, the most illiterate age of the primitive church, was the first, reaching down to the end of the second century. This may be considered to have been a wise dispensation of God, in order to cut off, as much as possible, any channel through which oral tradition might have been conveyed, to which mankind have ever been immoderately and foolishly attached. I am aware of the conjectures of the admirers of antiquity on this point, and the sort of *a priori* reasoning which they adopt. But their conjectures and reasoning do not comport with the circumstances of the times. The history of the Israelites presents in some respects a similar case. After their miraculous deliverance from Egypt, the giving of the law and the appointment of religious ordinances, their condition as a religious people became *very soon* exceedingly deteriorated; but in course of time it improved greatly, that is,

under the latter judges and the first kings, as the condition of the primitive church did as to learning and knowledge in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. But this improvement among the Israelites was followed, as in the case of the church, by gradual corruption, until after various changes, sometimes for the better, but mostly for the worse, they ceased to be the acknowledged people of God. The same thing may be said of the western church, the Church of Rome; *it has long ceased to be a part of the true church; for how can an heretical and antichristian church be the church of Christ?* Similar to the condition of the Jews, it is evidently in a state of *apostasy*, and has especially one mark which belongs to the Jews, an attachment to oral traditions.—*Letters on the Writings of the Fathers of the first two centuries. By Miso-papisticus*, p. 48.

(145.)—Into what gross errors, both as to doctrine and worship, has the Church of Rome fallen, since her Bishop set up for universality and thereby commenced that grand schism against all the Bishops of the earth, whom he sought to depress under him; but while he would thrust other churches from him, *he thrust himself from the Catholic Church.*—*Leslie*.

(146.)—For as the devil does ape God in his institutions of religion, his feasts, sacrifices, &c. so likewise in his priests, without whom no religion, whether true or false can stand. False religion is but a corruption of the true. The true was before it, though it be followed close upon the heels.—*Leslie on Deism*.

(147.)—And yet this course (an entire renunciation of Rome) can only be justified upon the ground that Rome is *no part of the true church of Christ*. Separation from the body of Christ involves the guilt of schism. . . . Our reformers define the church by the accredited principles of the body and by the due and faithful dispensation of the word and sacraments. Thus by *virtually* excommunicating the Church of Rome, she clears her own path of separation. It was separation without schism.—*Rev. C. Bridges.*

(148.) — . . . I do not think the essence of a church lies in *forms*; the essence of a church is *truth* and *godliness*; and wherever these are found I hail them as the genuine marks of spiritual and inseparable kindred. My reverend friend (Dr. O'Sullivan) has admirably exposed the blindness of a noble lord who could see no more impropriety in the establishment of the Church of Rome in Ireland, than in the establishment of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland! My reverend friend, perhaps, omitted one point which no man could have illustrated so well, that the so-called Church of Rome, is literally *not a church at all*, but a foreign monarchy grasping at universal dominion.—*Dr. Cooke's Speech at Belfast, Oct. 1837. See Record Nov. 8, 1837.*

(149.)—. . . What man of common sense can imagine that a pope thus elected by simoniacal arts and carnal interests, can be Christ's vicar on earth, or have the Holy Ghost always affixed to his chair, that he shall never err in any of his decrees? Truly, he that can believe this, may believe any thing that is gross and absurd. Is not the whole frame and contrivance of

that court turned so entirely secular, that *not a vestige of the character of a church, or of churchmen, remains?* And to this shall I add all the splendour of their apparel, the state of their processions, and the ceremonies of their coronation, and how they wear a triple crown? which being so well known to all who ever were at Rome need not be discarded on by me. From this I should descend to the cardinals, bishops, and abbots, and shew how secular they are become; *all their design being to engross power and monopolize all riches*; which contagion is also derived into the inferior orders of the clergy, who by the magnifying of their images, saints, and relics, use all the arts they can devise for enriching of themselves and their friends. . . All these things do fully prove how unlike that church is to the poor and pure simplicity of Christ and his apostles, and of the first ages of the church.—*Bishop Burnet. See Enchirid. Theol. Anti-Romanum. Vol. III. p. 40.*

(150.)— . . The wit of man could not devise any thing more serviceable to error, to make it spread in the world, and to fix it, than that a powerful see grasping at supremacy, and pretending to infallibility, should take it under her wing.

This see is the source of all those oppositions which they have met with that demanded a reformation, it is this see alone which hath obstructed a general reformation, when Christendom was otherwise well disposed towards it.

Therefore when reformation, by common consent, was made impossible by the see of Rome, what remained but that the national churches should reform themselves?

Our reformation was a return to primitive antiquity ; and that it may prove a leading example, let us pray without ceasing, that *God would bring into the way of truth all such as have erred, and are deceived.*—*Dr. Clagett. See Ench. Theol. Vol. III. p. 459.*

(151.)—... He (the Roman bishop) hath a better pretence to succeed the Roman Emperors in monarchy, than he hath to succeed any of the apostles ; and, indeed, that was the design, as they know that are skilled in the writers of ancient times. Rome seemed a place designed for empire, and when the emperors failed, then the bishops set up in their stead ; what the emperors could not hold by arms, the bishops would fetch in by religion, and so they obtrude upon all Christians, in truth, a *secular monarchy*, instead of that which my text (Acts 11. 42.) calls the fellowship of the apostles.—*A confutation of the chief doctrines of Popery by William Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester.*

(152.)—... You are deceived when you suppose that a church having such a creed (Pope Pius iv.) is the church of Christ. It renounced its allegiance to Christ when it declared a faith which neither he nor his apostles ever declared ; and denounced curses which he or they never denounced.—*Sermon by Rev. J. H. Stewart, on Jesus Christ the one Mediator, p. 15. 1828.*

(153.)—... Let us remember that the principles of a religion cannot be worth defending, if they are not worth diffusing ; and if we profess a genuine regard for the interests of our church, let us remember that it is

more than suspicious in its origin and in its tendency, if it is not expressed in zeal for the temporal and eternal interests of our fellow-creatures, and for the advancement of the glory and the kingdom of our God. There is one, indeed, in our land, who, in the face of contempt, and scorn, and insult, from Roman Catholics, and of no small reproach, too, for want of *judgment* and *discretion*, and *charity*, among those who ought to have known the truth of his principles, and followed his example, had the courage, the integrity, the fidelity, to announce to the Church of Rome the tremendous fact, that their church was a 'CHURCH WITHOUT A RELIGION.' He spoke a truth as certainly as the Bible is the revelation of Jehovah; and he has acted, in the lofty station which he fills in our church, with a consistency commensurate with the solemn tenour of his assertion. He has privately and publicly encouraged and supported those who have been anxious to maintain the truths of their religion in opposition to the awful errors under which our poor countrymen are groaning. He has granted every facility which his influence and his power could command, to maintain the doctrines of the established church, not only within his own diocese, but he permits his clergy to labour in a missionary sphere, under proper provisional restriction for the care of their own parochial duties, through all this blind and benighted country.—*Truth and Error contrasted by Rev. R. J. M'Ghee*, p. 260.

(154.)—What is the Roman Reformation? . . . It is the conversion of a religion affected by error into an ambitious and intolerant political system—a system well described in the passage which represents the Papal Religion 'as a state in which the Pope is feudal

sovereign—the bishops, peers—the priests, subjects—the people, slaves—and all dissenters, rebels.’

This is Dr. Phelan’s well known description of Romanism; had he added one further element,—‘the regular orders, a military,’ the representation would have been perfect. The Roman system is a political state, *not a religion*.—*Speech of Dr. O’Sullivan at Hereford Protestant Association.*

(155.)—The passage before us (1 Tim. iii. 14, 16) furnishes us, I think, in the next place, with the *test of a true Church*. So far is it from countenancing the arrogant claims of the Bishop of Rome, that it in fact *subverts* them. It teaches us to ask concerning every religious community, is it built on the great mystery of godliness? For if the Church is to be *the pillar and ground of the Truth*; and if that Truth be the *Mystery of God manifest in the flesh*; then it necessarily follows from these premises, that That is the true Church, and that only, which maintains the Deity, the manifestation, the kingdom of the Son of God; which inculcates these doctrines on the people, which defends them against error, and encircles them with those simple ordinances, and that right administration of the sacraments, which Christ hath prescribed in his word. On the other hand, in proportion as a Church is infected with false doctrines, corrupt traditions, superstition, idolatry, and the usurpation of secular dominion and power over the conscience, it ceases to be a pure part of the universal Church. And when any nominally Christian body denies the foundation of faith, *God manifest in the flesh*, and substitutes heathen ethics, a proud philosophy, and an ostentation of merely human reasoning, and hazard-

ous and unsound criticism ; it ceases, not merely from being a pure Church, but from being a Church of Christ at all. The spirit of the text seems obviously to imply that religious communities are *therefore*, and *so far*, and *so long*, branches of Christ's holy catholic Church, as they are *pillars and grounds of scriptural Truth*.

. . . If, therefore, any church—I now speak generally—be established on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone ; if it provides, so far as human prudence can, for a succession of faithful men to inculcate the great mystery of godliness on the people ; if it duly administer the sacraments of Christ's institution ; if it propound scriptural articles of faith, and afford devotional formularies of public-worship ; it is no solid objection against such a church, to state, that a larger effusion of the Holy Spirit has rested on it at one period than at another ; that some things are found in it, and especially as to the actual administration of its ministers, which every sincere friend of it laments, and labours to remove ; that langour and a secular spirit are at times too generally apparent ; that instances of erroneous or even heretical instruction may be detected ; or that local inconveniences arise from the particular effects of its general arrangements : these are points which no alteration of an ecclesiastical platform can wholly amend. To advance these objections is only to say, that the church in question is not a perfect one. Before the members of such a church can consistently withdraw from its communion, a case must be shewn, something like to that of our Reformers when they came out from the Church of Rome—that her doctrines and ceremonies, once pure and edifying, have become decidedly unscriptural and idolatrous ;

that she has altered the articles and formularies of her faith, corrupted the truths of her first founders, and brought in doctrines which *sap and overthrow, directly or by consequence, some of the first principles of Christianity*; whilst a claim of infallibility is set up, all attempts at reformation indignantly spurned, and those who would return to her own original tenets persecuted and silenced.

. . . I am sure you will agree with me, that our own Church, established by the mercy of God in these kingdoms, has a claim on our most affectionate and filial reverence and support. The great mystery of God *manifest in the flesh* is the foundation of her Articles, her Liturgy, her Homilies. Not only is the Deity and Sacrifice of the Son of God recognized, but it is incorporated in all her services. Her prayers are offered up in the alone name and merits of Christ; her doctrines are founded on his humiliation, atonement, glory, and intercession; her festivals celebrate his nativity, circumcision, manifestation, passion, resurrection, mission of the Holy Ghost, and future coming to judge the world. Her devotional formularies breathe the very language of a renewed heart: her administration of the sacraments is simple, yet edifying and sublime: her order of church government is, to say the least, most conformable to the primitive standard; her offices of consecration and ordination fence round her ministry, and are adapted to perpetuate an orthodox and spiritual and holy priesthood. But more especially is her confession of faith in her Thirty-nine Articles, expanded as it is in her admirable Homilies, amongst the most pure and scriptural of all the Protestant formularies. It rests on the sufficiency of Holy Scripture alone, for salvation: it establishes the proper Divinity and Propitiation of the

Son of God: it avows the total corruption of our nature, its impotency to any thing spiritually good, and the necessity of preventing grace, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, to the production of any good works. It maintains *the great Protestant doctrine of justification by faith only*, and insists on the obedience of a Christian, as the necessary fruit and evidence of a lively faith; and it teaches us, finally, to ascribe all our salvation to the special grace and mercy of Him, who hath chosen us in Christ, according to his everlasting purpose, before the foundations of the world were laid.

... Every thing in order to prosper, must be placed on its true and natural footing. That for which the whole institution of church polity subsists is, that it may be *the pillar and ground*, not of ceremonies, but of Truth. Let Truth, then, the Truth of a Divine Saviour, Truth as fruitful in good works, be presented conspicuously before the eyes of men. Other matters may then fall into their place. The necessary rules of church discipline and subjection, as the shadow accompanies the substance, will, if duly inculcated, follow naturally after the body and reality of Spiritual Religion. Reverse the order, and you destroy both.

This, this is the security of any church, the mighty power of godliness. The mystery of Christ, acknowledged, inculcated, preached, believed on—in the spirit which dictated the Protestant Articles and Confessions, and which brought our Reformers out from the Church of Rome—the mystery of the person of Christ, abased indeed, but justified, and, amongst angels and men, proclaimed the King of Glory and Lord and Saviour of men—this is the characteristic, and true preservative, of all Christian Churches. Around this stupendous truth the decent vesture of

primitive discipline will enfold itself: without it, they will, they must, inevitably sink into decay.—*Sermon preached before the Prayer Book and Homily Society, 1819, by Rev. D. Wilson, (now Bishop of Calcutta), p. 30, 47.*

(156.)—Mr. Melvill has more than once distinctly stated, that in his opinion the Roman Catholic is a true apostolic church, holding Christ the Head. The last time that he gave utterance, publicly, to this sentiment, was in his sermon on the 5th of November, and his language, in substance, was as follows:—‘ Let the saying be misunderstood and perverted, as it has been when I have said it before, we will say it again and again, that the Roman Catholic Church is a true apostolic church, holding the Head, which is Christ, though in much darkness, and with fatal superstition, and deriving the ordination of its ministers in unbroken succession from the apostles, through the channel which alone had the sanction of antiquity, and therefore, as I firmly believe, the sanction of authority.’

Now it may excite unmeasured indignation, though perhaps, little or no surprise, when an infidel member of parliament, who considers a solemn reference to the God and Father of us all, to be cant, humbug, and hypocrisy, is heard to express a willingness to *swear that black is white*,—but it does excite surprise, and shall be for a lamentation, when a Protestant clergyman is heard to declare that the same fountain can send forth both sweet water and bitter, and to express a conviction that an idolatrous church, with a deceived heart and a lie in her right hand, is nevertheless built upon the foundation of prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. To this

length, however, Mr. Melvill's statements unquestionably go ; for he asserts in one sentence, that the Roman Catholic is a true church of Christ, and in another, that it is *Antichrist* and that **THE PAPACY IS THE BEAST** : and in tracing the connexion between our national misfortunes, and the existence of papal influence in our country, he observed, in a bold and appropriate figure, that ' the British Lion had been shorn of its might, whensoever it had made an alliance with the *Beast* ; and had only recovered its strength when it shook the mark—the mark of the *Beast* from its mane.' **POPERY**, we were told, is *not changed*—Popery, ' pre-eminent in cruelty'—Popery, with its, ' thousand innovations of genuine Christianity, *damning* to the souls of men'—Popery, with its, ' immense train of subordinate mediators', compelling the dying catholic to exclaim, ' I could never get a sight of the Saviour,'—Popery with its ' tenets inconsistent with Scripture, at variance with civil liberty, actually destructive to the soul, and irreconcilable with salvation!'—and to sum up the whole, the preacher emphatically exclaimed, ' Let Protestantism be assailed, let there be any attempt at reinstating *the man of sin* in the position from which he has been hurled, and thoroughly do we believe there would be raised something of the same spirit in our land, as though an invader's foot were on our shore, or a traitor in its councils.'

Turn we now to the testimony of another ' angel of the temple.' ' I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the *Beast* that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads (the seven heads are seven mountains) and ten horns. The *Beast* which thou sawest shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and shall go into perdition.' Again ' Let no man deceive you by any means ; for that day shall not come, except there

come a falling away first, and that *man of sin* be revealed THE SON OF PERDITION, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.' Lastly, 'Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and NOT HOLDING THE HEAD.'

When I hear, then, that the Roman Catholic Church is a church of Christ, true and apostolic, and I search the scriptures to see whether these things be so, I find, indeed, that *they are not so*. In them I learn that the prophets of this Church are false, and her apostles messengers of Satan ; not loving the truth, she is under a strong delusion to believe a lie ; and, above all, with signs and lying wonders, she sitteth in the temple of God, *not holding the head*. Thus it is abundantly evident that the papacy, with cunning craftiness, has assumed the form and image of the church she '*sitteth in the temple of God ;*' but not holding the Head, which is Christ, she has crowded into her service an immense train of subordinate mediators, and has hereby virtually thrust out the Saviour both from his Church and from his office. Hence, her beginning is from Satan, in her progress she shall fill up the measure of her iniquity, and her latter end shall be that she perish for ever.—*A writer in the Record under the signature of a Protestant, Dec. 4, 1837.*

(157.) — . . . Is the Roman Catholic Church a true and Apostolic Church ? The Rev. Mr. Melvill says it is, because 'its ministers have been duly invested with authority to preach the Word and dispense the Sacraments,' and because it has ever held 'the head.'

. . . The question, we think, is sufficiently distinct. The Papal apostasy assumes that she is **THE CHURCH**. The question is, is she *a Church of Christ* at all? Various communities, as well as individuals, frequently assume that they are what they are not. And by this discussion it is attempted to test the truth of the assumption in the case of Rome. If the question be distinct, it is obviously no less important, and peculiarly so in the present day. Rome has been ever famous for turning admissions in her favour to the best account. In dealing with the Protestant population of the Three Kingdoms at present, which she is doing with wonderful skill, energy, and we must add success, she ever holds she is the *one Christian Church*, and that all Protestants are her lapsed and apostate children. And what use does she make of such admissions as that of Mr. Melvill? "You perceive," says she, "that even he who abuses us in the use of every evil term, is forced to acknowledge from the undeniable character of the fact, that we are '*a true and Apostolic Church*.' Will you not then rather cast in your lot with a Church which even her bitterest enemies are forced to admit to be 'true and apostolic,' than join any of those lapsed and divided communities, which we, the successors and representatives of the apostles, assure you are alien to the Church, and the members of which are without the pale of salvation." We show the use made of the admission, not with a view to withhold it if it be just, but simply to mark its importance. . . .

Our first inquiry on the subject is, "What saith the Scripture?" Has the Great Head of the Church left his people in darkness on the subject? If not, let us "hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches." . . . There are few important subjects in which there

is such an uniformity of judgment in the Orthodox Protestant Church as in this, that Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse. In what terms does "the Spirit" speak of her? Is she any where spoken of as the Church or spouse of Christ? Is she any where addressed as corrupt and fallen, as are some of the Seven Churches, but still spoken to as a Church of Christ? Or is the Pope ever addressed as the angel of a Church, even when the heaviest of judgments are denounced against him if he do not repent—as in the case of Laodicea? No. We believe we find nothing of this kind in the Word of God. But we find such descriptions of her as the following:—

"Upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." "Come hither; I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore . . . with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. He hath judged the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand." "For by thy sorceries were all nations deceived, and in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." What is one of the practical issues to which God leads us by these accounts? "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

We believe there are no opposing texts to these to be found within the compass of the revelation of God.

These are the words of the Great Head of the Church, speaking, by the Spirit, unto the churches. Are the terms not distinct? Is there to be found a word in the whole indicative of the addresses being made to a church of Christ? Is it not obvious to every man of plain and unsophisticated mind, who has no theory to support, that words more strong and pungent could not be found to designate, not "a true and Apostolic church," but an *apostasy*—in short, the great "ANTI-CHRIST." How, we ask, can *Antichrist* be identified with "a true and Apostolic church?" So much for the testimony of Scripture.

We reach the same conclusion from the Articles of our own church. They do not state in so many words that Rome is Antichrist; but the inference from their statements that Rome is not a true church is direct and incontrovertible.

'The visible church of Christ,' according to the 19th Article, 'is a congregation of faithful men, in the which *the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance*, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.'

First, the 'pure word of God is *not* preached' by the papacy. So far from it, that, laying aside the less sweeping and fundamental of her perversions of Scripture, she shifts entirely the ground of a sinner's justification before God, making it, in fact, to rest on human merit, of which she holds that the saints may not only have enough for themselves, but a great deal to spare for others, and which supererogatory treasure of good works is in the keeping of the church, to be freely dispensed by her as she pleases to those who lack. Justly may Mr. Melvill say, as he views this and other perversions of the Gospel by the papacy,

that ‘ he cannot see how a man, holding the doctrines of Rome, *as set forth in her authorised documents*, can be saved.’ How, then, can it be said, that ‘ the pure word of God is preached’ by her ?

If she fails in this division of the description of ‘ the visible church of Christ,’ given in the article, does she come out clear, as it regards the other, namely, “ in the which the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ’s ordinance ?”

Not to dwell upon the fact, that, while our Lord appointed *two* sacraments, the papists have increased them to *seven*,—nor to expose their abuse of the sacrament of baptism, which, however, we consider very gross, we ask, is the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper duly administered ?

In the 28th and 30th Articles of our Church, it is said, that the doctrine of transubstantiation ‘ is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, *overthroweth the nature of a sacrament*, and hath given occasion to many superstitions,’ and that the sacrifices of masses ‘ *are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.*’ If the view, then, which the papists take of this ordinance ‘ overthroweth the nature of a sacrament,’ and ‘ is a blasphemous fable,’ the sacraments are any other ‘ than duly administered ;’ and the papacy on this ground, as well as from not preaching ‘ the pure word of God,’ is, according to the authority of our church, brought in, as no true church—as not belonging even to ‘ the visible church of Christ.

Having thus the testimony of Scripture on the subject, having that testimony responded to in the Articles of our church, and having Mr. Melvill giving expression to the judgment of truly enlightened Christians of the present day, and which is the counterpart of the decision of the first British and continental martyrs

and confessors, that 'popery is the *predicted apostasy* of the latter times,' 'the mystic Babylon of the *Apocalypse*,' a *blasphemous, idolatrous, unscriptural, and apostate* church, (which description of her is so far in cordial agreement with the Scriptures and the church), we have now to examine the grounds, which, in Mr. Melvill's esteem, still entitle Rome to be viewed as 'a true and Apostolic church.' These are, as we have seen, that 'her ministers have been duly invested with authority to preach the word, and dispense the sacraments,' and that 'she has never ceased to hold the Head, which is Christ, and to acknowledge that Jesus, God as well as man, died as the propitiation for the sins of the world.'

We do not think the last doctrinal ground will sustain any part of the superstructure Mr. Melvill would build upon it. The papacy professes, indeed, to believe in Christ; but she does not, otherwise he would be her Saviour. In that case, it were impossible that 'a man holding the doctrines of Rome, *as set forth in her authorised documents*, should not be saved.' On the contrary Mr. Melvill says, he cannot see how a man, so believing *can be saved*. It thus appears, according to Mr. Melvill's showing, in which we consider him to be supported by all competent witnesses, that the papacy *does not hold the head*—does not view the death of Christ any more than his life, *in such a manner* as to give life and salvation to her members. We all know profession to be nothing. She professes to hold the Head, but she does not; to believe in Christ, but she does not; for if she did, it were inevitable that she preached salvation—it were impossible that the Saviour should speak of her in the awful terms which we have quoted. The following words of the apostle are strictly applicable to her, and whe-

ther they be justly applied to an individual, that individual is no Christian, or to a community, that community is no church. ‘*They profess they know God but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.*’ On this ground, therefore, we cannot believe that the papacy is a true and Apostolic church, unless we identify *profession* with *principle*, or take the *form* for the *substance*.

The primary ground, however, on which Mr. Melvill appears to rest this opinion, is, that ‘her bishops and presbyters derive their authority in an unbroken line from Christ and his apostles.’

The ordination given by Christ and his apostles was to “*preach the GOSPEL.*” “Go ye into all the world and *preach the Gospel* to every creature, and, lo, I am with you always to the end of the world.” This privilege was only to be committed to ‘*faithful* men who should be able to teach others also.’ In exact conformity with this truth, our church will not lay her hands upon any man till he has solemnly avouched that he believes he has been “inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost” to take upon himself the office of the ministry. If he has not been so moved, if he does not know, nor preach the Gospel, and the Church has taken due care not to be deceived before she laid her hands upon him, his guilt, and it is deep guilt, is altogether on his own head. He is no minister of Christ. He has no authority from the Great Head of the Church. He has obtained entrance into the church by making a false profession, and as it is said of the wicked in the 29th Article, who partake of the Sacrament of the Supper, that “although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of

Christ,' so eminently of such false teachers, though they have been 'carnally and visibly' ordained as the ministers of Christ, they are not partakers of his Spirit, and are consequently wholly unfurnished for his work. They stand in the position of ambassadors, who, charged to deliver to a nation a message from their sovereign, deliver something altogether opposed to that with which they were entrusted. No higher insult than this can be offered to the King of kings; and such false messengers, instead of being listened to with respect, ought to be rejected with abhorrence.

When the predicted "falling away" came—when "the man of sin," "the son of perdition was revealed," and began to wax stronger and stronger—these false teachers grew and multiplied in every part of the falling church, till at last, when that "mystery of iniquity" which already wrought in the apostolic age, arrived at maturity, and "that wicked one" was fully established who "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or is worshipped;" men in fact were ordained to do the service of "the synagogue of Satan," and not as ministers of Christ. They were sworn to maintain the doctrines of the papacy, described by Mr. Melvill as idolatrous, blasphemous, false, and apostate, in opposition to the glorious Gospel of the ever-blessed God; and well did they do the work they had undertaken, sealing it with the blood of myriads of the martyrs of the Lamb!

The circumstance, accordingly, of the papacy having been entrusted with the message of the Gospel by 'faithful men,' but instead of preserving it entire, and proclaiming it in the ears of a perishing world from generation to generation, having by their 'blasphemous' and 'idolatrous' traditions, corrupted and rendered it of none effect, instead of serving, in our

esteem, to improve its title to the character of a 'true and Apostolic church,' only deepens its guilt, and marks with greater distinctness, its apostasy.

We are far, however, from saying that at the darkest period of the papacy, there were not within her both ministers and people who apprehended and served Christ, to their eternal salvation. The exhortation, "Come out of her, my people," clearly implies this fact. But these laid hold of Christ not by means of the papacy, but in spite of her. With all her attempts to hide and destroy this sacred treasure committed to her, she has never wholly succeeded. It has still existed, though, in the general, lost in a darkness that might be felt, of her creation. Obviously, in our days, when Protestantism comes, in its purity, into immediate contact with her, it reflects a light upon her darkness. In this happy land, for instance, she is forced, though with a niggard, reluctant, and envenomed hand, to give the charter of salvation to her children, which in Italy, and Hungary, in Spain and Portugal, she systematically and most sedulously withholds. And here again, beyond contradiction, those of her members who embrace the truth, have found the pearl of great price, not by means of her, but in spite of her. The distinction which Mr. Melvill makes in reference to this subject is perfectly just. He says, "he cannot see how a man, holding the doctrines of Rome, *as set forth in her authorised documents*, can be saved."

We cannot subscribe to the accuracy of the restricted definition of the term *Apostolic*, as applied to a church, which is given by one of our correspondents, namely, that it indicates merely the regular succession of the *form* of ordination instituted by the apostles. The true meaning of the term, in our apprehension,

and according, as we believe, to the general understanding of the church, is that brought before us in the second chapter of the Ephesians. "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." "A true and apostolic church" is one resting on Christ as its foundation, which is built up in the doctrines promulgated by Christ, his apostles, and prophets, which has thus the light of salvation in itself, and diffuses it in its measure on the surrounding darkness. That 'the form of ordination' has ever been preserved by the papacy cannot be denied to her; that our church derived it from her (though she says she had a right to withdraw what she gave, upon our departing from *that belief, in consequence of the profession of which she gave it,*) may be admitted; though we confess we are not of the number of those who attach any considerable value to it. The words of our Article on the subject are cautious in the extreme, and we should think it well if the church could be persuaded simply to rest upon it. 'It is not lawful,' says the 23d Article, 'for any man to take upon himself the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.' The papacy, which seeks to attract all things to herself, of course made every thing of ordination. It has not saved her from apostasy, or from being the outcast and accursed of God; nor, we are persuaded, will it materially assist any other. We must assuredly mainly rest on another and sounder foundation—namely, on Christ—on the apostolic and evangelical

articles and confessions of our church. Resting really on the Incarnate Saviour; lifting him up, in his person and offices, scripturally unfolded, as the Saviour of a lost world, the church is answering the purpose for which it is established, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

On these grounds we rest our opinion that the papacy is not 'a true and apostolic church,' but apostate,—disowned and rejected of Christ. We can in no degree concur in the opinion of one of our correspondents, that she is partly true and partly apostate, because she still professes to hold some orthodox doctrines. The scope and effect of her creed is to lead men away from the salvation of Christ, for which, according to Mr. Melvill, she substitutes doctrines, 'blasphemous and idolatrous,' or, to use the expressions of a correspondent who supports his views, 'dangerous, heretical, and damnable.' Perhaps the chief effect of the measure of truth, which she still professes to hold, is to enable her to point and carry home her deadly errors with surer effect and over a wider sphere. Whatever measure of the truth she still chooses to retain, her "*coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs and lying wonders, and with all DECEIVABLENESS OF UNRIGHTEOUSNESS.*" This is the decision of the great Head of the Church with regard to her; that decision is ever wrought out, in clearer and clearer characters, in many of the passages of Holy Writ, which we have already quoted. And CHRIST having spoken, the reasonings of ourselves or others on the subject are of little avail, but in so far as they illustrate the truth of his sure and unerring word.

... We consider the *external* unity attempted by the papacy—the attempt to bring the whole Christian body under one human head, the Pope, and thus con-

stituting, according to the papacy, the church against which the gates of hell should not prevail, originated, not in the will of God, neither was it according to the mind of the Spirit, but is mainly to be traced to carnal, worldly, and wicked ambition ; and certainly the fruit produced, namely, " the man of sin," was strictly according to the nature of the seed sown. The external union did not reach its full growth till the head and body were awfully corrupted — till idolatry in image worship was becoming fixed and established — and the system, as Milner says, had ' become too corrupt to deserve the name of the church of Christ.' That this bold and ambitious attempt was not according to the mind of the Spirit we conclude, not merely from the corruption in which it originated, and the idolatrous pollutions in which it was perfected, and amidst which for centuries it continued to be maintained, but from the fact that the apostles, gifted with the plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost, attempted nothing of the kind . . . They did not seek to unite into ONE OUTWARD BODY, the various churches. To make of Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, the seven Asiatic churches, Phillippi, Corinth, &c. &c. ' one catholic and apostolic church,' by placing them under one head, by forming one mighty earthly hierarchy. This was not *their* mode of making " one body in Christ." As wise master-builders, they built them " upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone." They appointed them a wise and efficient system of ecclesiastical government and discipline. They earnestly commended unity among themselves severally, they inculcated upon them the dread of schism and division, and recommended and enforced all godly and brotherly communication with " all the churches of Christ." But here they

stopped. On this system the churches proceeded during the early ages of Christianity. Some waxing large, and some continuing small, and distinguished by differences in minor things suitable to the diversity in their outward circumstances. But it was in these various communities, that we saw, in the apostolic and early ages of the church, "the one body" of Christ.

And so in the palmy days of the Romish apostasy, "the one body" of Christ, was not to be seen and found in the outward body of "the man of sin," but in Christ's concealed members—in his hidden ones—who either escaped ecclesiastical notice, or were cast out of "the church," and persecuted and slain for the testimony of Jesus:—in the Waldenses, the Albigenses, and other faithful witnesses to the truth, amidst general apostasy from the fundamental doctrines, the genuine spirit, and holy practice of the Gospel.

And so again when the papacy was partially broken up at the time of the Reformation, the faithful men who were the instruments of building again the church on that one foundation against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, did not attempt the formation of "one catholic and apostolic church" in respect of *outward* unity, or did they affect identity of practice in outward forms or dress, as forming an essential part of the constitution of "the one body." Churches were formed for kingdoms, and churches for single cities. The founder of the Presbyterian church of Geneva for a single city, gave valuable assistance in the formation of the Episcopal church for the realm of England, and at a later period, we hear Bishop Hall talking of the foreign continental reformed churches as "the dear spouse of Christ," whose outward dress and church polity were vastly different from those adopted by his own community.

In all these reformed churches, so long as they remained sound in the faith, we saw substantially the same spectacle as in the apostolic churches; namely, "different members of the *same body*;" having "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in them all." They constituted at that time, with other stray members throughout the world (what the apostolic churches did in their day), "the one body," "the one Catholic and Apostolic Church" "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."—*The Record*, Dec. 28, 1835, and Jan. 7, 1836.

(158.) — . . . It is said that the papists receive the Bible! True. Yet they receive many things not to be found in the Bible, things which flatly contradict the inspired volume. Consequently they virtually reject the Bible. The articles of the creed of Pope Pius IV. are directly opposed to the word of God: hence the Scriptures are rejected as a rule of faith, because the papists are aware that the Bible and the new creed cannot stand together.

The papists contend that the Pope is the foundation of the church; but the Bible declares that Christ is the only foundation. They contend that the Scriptures are not sufficient to teach the way of salvation; the Apostle assures us that they are all-sufficient. Popery overthrows the foundation of faith; not, indeed, in express terms, but in reality—since it makes additions which endanger its safety. The great fundamental doctrine of justification by faith alone is set aside by the popish notion of human merits. The all-sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice is set aside by the sacrifice of the mass. The doctrine of satisfaction for sin by the

atonement of Jesus is set aside by the popish dogma of purgatory ; while the mediation of the Saviour is nullified by praying to saints and angels and the Virgin Mary. Protestants believe that oaths and promises are sacred things, and binding on the conscience ; but the Church of Rome teaches that faith is not to be kept with heretics ; and that solemn engagements may be broken for the good of the church.

By comparing the doctrines of papists with sacred writ, it will be seen that the popish dogmas and the Bible are opposite to each other. The most unlearned Protestant may adopt this method ; nor will the most learned papist be able to confute him. The process is a simple one, and must be successful. It is a fact which cannot be disproved, that no one becomes a papist till he despises or disregards the Bible, and believes the word of the priest rather than the word of God.

It is asserted by some Protestants, that the Church of Rome is a *true* church, and that her members are *Christians*. But those persons who maintain doctrines at variance with the Bible, cannot be Christians in reality. The papists receive doctrines which Christ never taught, and which his word condemns : how then can they be viewed as his followers ?

Let Protestants attend to these things, with the Bible in their hands, and it will not be possible for *popish* priests to lead them astray. The preceding remarks will show the *fallacy* of the Romish assertions respecting the *antiquity* of their church. It must be evident that the Reformation was the restoration of the purity of the church in doctrine and worship. Whatever, therefore, may have been the case prior to the Council of Trent, from that time the Church of Rome has not been a branch of the true catholic

church.* She may arrogate to herself the title of the *Catholic Church*, but as she teaches doctrines fundamentally erroneous, she has no right whatever to the sacred designation. She may be termed the church of the pope, or the synagogue of Satan, since she teaches doctrines which originated in the father of lies; but the church of Christ she cannot be.—*Protestantism the Old Religion; Popery the New*, by Rev. Thomas Lathbury, p. 21.

(159.)—Let the second note or mark of a corrupt church be this, *That she enjoins things contrary to the express injunctions of Holy Scripture*. I must ask you here whether you expect I should prove this to be the infallible mark of a corrupt church? Can that church possibly be a *true* and pure one that bids us do what God peremptorily forbids, or prohibits that which he commands? Will the infallibility of the church do on this occasion, wherein it is opposed directly to the infallibility of God? If we have not been beat out of our reason, it will answer, No. With great modesty, surely, may it venture on that negative, for which it neither hath, nor can have, any other alternative than downright blasphemy. But wherein does the Church of Rome thus directly coun-

* The Church of Rome cannot with any propriety be called a branch of the true catholic church for many centuries prior to the Council of Trent, as the following passage from the Homilies will show:—'Now, if you will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present and hath been for the space of *nine hundred years* and odd—you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true church, that nothing can be more.'—*Homily for Whitsunday*.—EDITOR.

term and the orders of Almighty God? Why, God says, "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image, or the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." And the Church of Rome says, "Thou shalt bow down to graven images, and worship them." God says of the cup in the Eucharist, "Drink ye all of this." And the Church of Rome says, "Ye shall not all drink of this." God says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only thou shalt serve." And the Church of Rome says, "Thou shalt worship the Virgin Mary; thou shalt also pray to her and serve her." Many other instances, as strongly contradictory as these, though perhaps not altogether so obvious, might be assigned; but one may be sufficient; for what church shall dare to oppose the will of God? It is but an aggravation of the presumption to say, he authorizes us thus to contradict himself.

. . . Let the third mark of a corrupt church be this, *that she is idolatrous*; that is, *that she both prescribes and practises the worship of creatures*. We may amuse ourselves as long as we please with idle distinctions about degrees of worship. The worship so severely prohibited in Scripture, and by all true religion, is prayer to, and dependance on an absent creature. Either this is idolatry, or there can be no such thing. When, either on common occasions, or in our extraordinary distresses, we kneel down, and offer up our prayers to any being, whom we believe in heaven, we attribute to that being the omnipresence or omniscience of God; we love and trust in that being, as more ready and able to help us than any other, or why should we thus address ourselves to

him? It is ridiculous to plead humility, when we thus apply to an absent creature, not only because he may happen not to hear us, but because we know God is infinitely condescending to the addresses of his creatures, or why do we ever presume to pray immediately to him; because we know he hath commanded us to pray directly to himself; and also because we know, that so far as we stand in need of a mediator, we have one at the right hand of God, who hath already shewn us infinitely greater marks of his condescension and readiness to help us, than that of attending to our prayers?

Having shewn that praying to absent creatures is idolatry, we ought also to observe, that idolatry is a damnable sin, and represented to us as such, both by reason and Scripture. Does not reason and common sense tell us, that since there is but one God, he alone ought to be worshipped and prayed to? The love and dependence of an intelligent creature are not to be alienated from its Maker, without an infinite offence to the former, and an equal loss to the latter. But when creatures become, in any degree, the objects of our worship, in the same degree are our hearts estranged and turned aside from God; and turned aside to what? Why, to beings as little able to help themselves as we are; to beings, whose happiness, whose very subsistence, results from perpetual acts of worship paid to God on their own account. Does not the infinitely gracious Being, in condescending to make, to teach, to redeem, to comfort us, call up our affections and dependence to himself, and sufficiently encourage our continual addresses? Nay, does he not evidently appear, by all his dealings with us, earnestly to court our love, in a manner infinitely more tender and more engaging than that of our fellow-creatures, who can-

not be happy without it? and does he not, in his word, represent himself as a husband jealous of our affections on this very subject of his worship? How often does he peremptorily forbid us to have any other object of adoration but himself; awfully inculcating his justice, his power, his majesty, that we may fear him; pathetically pleading his mercy and bounty, that we may love him; and strongly assuring us of his truth and faithfulness, that we may depend upon him? Shall we, thus solicited by the infinite Being himself, foolishly and impiously solicit any other? No, my brethren, let us from our very souls, detest the most distant thought of so enormous a practice, and look, with a mixture of horror and pity, on that church which prescribes it, as abandoned to a most unhappy infatuation. Fly far from her, you whom God, in mercy to your souls, hath already taught to see her danger. And you, who have been unhappily educated in her communion, hear his voice, who cries from heaven saying, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

Let the fourth mark of a corrupt church be this, *That she still pretends to the power of working miracles, in confirmation of such doctrines and practices as those I have mentioned*, although every rational creature sees she is wholly destitute of that power, and, instead of miracles, only palms on the undiscerning a miserable legerdemain of pranks, so impudent in the performance, and so impious in the application, that she is in the right on't to extinguish the sense and reason of her votaries before she attempts to feed their credulity with such a juggle. God was pleased to

make use of miracles, truly such, as the best, or I should rather say, as the only satisfactory proofs of divine revelation. But as real miracles give the highest attestation to the mission of the worker, so, of all things, a pretended miracle detected, is the most apt to throw the imputation of falsity on the cause that employs it; first, Because it amounts, in fact, to a confession, that the want of other proofs makes this necessary; and, secondly, Because there is no believing men who presume to deal between God and the world by a method so impiously disingenuous. He that offers any other kind of proof may think it valid, and therefore it is not demonstration, that he intends to deceive, but in this kind, every man must know, before he begins, whether he is going to work a real miracle, or to belie the source of all wisdom and power, by a detestable piece of villany, than which, if he should chance to be found out, no one thing in the world can more effectually bring suspicion on real miracles, or so deeply wound the true religion. It follows, therefore, that the worker of a pretended miracle must be considered as a man of no religion, as a most atheistical deceiver. It is true, indeed, that a very wrong-headed man, through an unaccountable species of zeal, or a wrong-hearted one, for some by-ends of his own, may attempt to impose on the superstitious by such a practice, even in favour of the truth. But we are not here speaking of madmen; neither is it our intention to represent any church, or cause, as responsible for the unauthorised conduct of fools and knaves. But we insist, that every church, setting herself forth as empowered to work miracles, when she knows she is not, is a *fallacious church*, and must be held responsible for all the juggling pranks of her party. Now, the heads of a church cannot possibly

be ignorant, whether they are entrusted with the miraculous powers or not ; and therefore, if knowing their own inability herein, they actually set up for these powers, they are infinitely worse than a gang of banditti ; because they attempt to spoil us of somewhat, in comparison of which our worldly possessions are nothing, and that not without a design on our purses as well as our minds ; they rob on the road to heaven, and commit the vilest sort of crime in the name of God. A sanctified impostor, an holy villain, are of all others the most detestable appellations ; and he that deserves them may dispute precedency with the grand deceiver.

But can it be possible that this most enormous crime is chargeable on any church presuming to call itself by the name of Christ ? Yes ; the Church of Rome universally lays claim to the power of working miracles ; and Cardinal Bellarmine makes it the eleventh note, whereby that church may be proved to be the *true* church. But the frequent detection of her miracles, in almost every country of Europe, hath thoroughly exposed her claim to the ridicule even of the more rational Papists, if such men may be called rational, who can continue to communicate with a church so palpably convicted of this impious fraud. If these miracles are real, why are they wrought only in popish countries, and before a mob of bigots, who do not need such food for their credulity ? Why not here among us heretics, who cannot be converted to popery, without more and greater miracles than were exhibited in proof of Christianity ? But, I suppose, our adherence to sense and reason hath rendered us unworthy of this glorious dispensation. Well, if it is so, we must even put up with it ; and having the use of our senses, must be contented without the Virgin's milk, and of our

reason, without the blood of Januarius. Besides, we have the less reason to regret the want of these modern miracles, since we took the liberty to read the scriptures; for there we find our blessed Saviour, and his apostles, made these very miracles the signs of heresy and imposture. "False Christs," says our Saviour, "and false prophets, shall arise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect." "Then," that is, in the latter times, saith St. Paul, "shall that wicked one be revealed—even he whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." And who prompts these false teachers to recommend their pernicious doctrines with pretended miracles? St. John tells us, he saw these prompters; namely, "Three unclean spirits, like frogs, coming out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet; for they are the spirits of devils working miracles." Thus we see what epithet is due to that church, which, pretending to miracles, hath been publicly convicted of imposture, in numberless instances.—*The marks of Dangerous Corruption found in the Church of Rome by the Rev. Philip Skelton. See The Protestant's Manual by James Cockrane, A.M.*

(160.)—While the church of England admitted that the Church of Rome was a true church,* the Puritans

* Where does the Church of England make any such admission? Certainly not in her authorised formularies, for in them she distinctly states that the Church of Rome is "so far wide from the nature of the true church that nothing can be more." See Homily for Whitsunday, part 2.

on the other hand, denied that fact, and asserted that it was not only Antichrist, and the beast of the Apocalypse, but its communion was damnable, it was one entire mass of corruption and idolatry. This opinion was the result of their outrageous fanaticism. Popery is indeed bad ; it abounds with numerous errors, and errors which are lamentably dangerous and delusive to all its votaries, whether enlightened or ignorant ; yet were Protestants to reject all that Papists believe, they would speedily reject Christianity. With the Puritans, however, this was inconceivable. They affirmed, with the most unparelled bigotry, that Papists were not Christians, that they believed not one single doctrine of the gospel, that they were gross idolaters. The Scotch Calvinists had made the notable discovery, that popery had not such high claims to antiquity as Judaism, that Mohammedanism was a religion infinitely preferable to Roman Catholicism, and therefore they denounced all who presumed even to hold converse with them, as sharers in idolatrous commerce. The same monstrous notions prevailed amongst the English Puritans, which were the effects of those opinions they entertained respecting the polity of the church. While the Episcopalian avoided this phrensy, he struck at Popery a more deadly blow. That the Church of Rome is a true church, cannot be denied ; *in fundamentals it agrees with every Protestant,** it has equally one faith, one hope, one baptism ; but it is woefully corrupt, overwhelmed in superstition ; and its politics are directly subversive of a well-regulated state, unless controlled by the strong and salutary arm of power. Its transubstantiation, purgatory, prayers for the dead, vain and mechanical cere-

* See this opinion refuted from Page 306 to 314 inclusive.

monies, invocations of saints, assumption of plenary power and of universal rule, restriction of the priesthood, and investment of the Bishop of Rome with the headship of the church on earth,—these, and many other untenable and absurd superstitions, do not militate against the assertion that it is fundamentally a true church. They prove it to be woefully degenerate and corrupt, but do not prove it false,—nay, though it were one entire mass of leaven, still its ordination is sacred and apostolic: but much more it is a true church, amidst all its declensions and apostacies, when it admits and asserts the fundamental doctrine of the Trinity, and holds our divine Saviour to be the Son of God. And if it be divested of this character of a true though a corrupt church, where, then, is the Church of England? Where the validity of the sacred office of ordination? Where that apostolical transmission of its orders, which dissenters and schismatics affect to treat as visionary and absurd? Believing much more to be implied in valid ordination than what dissenters are taught to believe, or are willing to allow; it appears to me that were the church of England to deny that the communion of the Church of Rome is a true church it would immediately degenerate into a mere sectarian association.

Nor does this concession to the Church of Rome in the least degree countenance its declension and apostasy; on the contrary, it places that church in a far more dangerous situation; it charges it with wilful perversion of the canon of inspiration, with a crafty admission of vain and fabulous traditions, with an unjust and merciless domination over the bodies and the souls of men.—Such were Laud's sentiments; and while he admitted that it was a true church, he denied its supremacy and exclusive Catholicism. *Rev. J. P. Lawson's*

Life and Times of Archbishop Laud, Vol. II. p. 38—40.

[The foregoing extract from Mr. Lawson's work may be taken as a fair specimen of the reasoning usually employed by those who maintain that the Church of Rome is a true church.* Mr. Lawson asserts that the Church of Rome agrees in *fundamentals* with every Protestant Church; that it has equally one faith, one hope, one baptism. He, however,

* There is a material difference in the line of argument pursued by Mr. Lawson and Mr. Melvill. Though the latter contradicts himself, and seems to have very confused ideas on the subject, still he does not suppress the truth, or attempt to screen the Church of Rome from deserved obloquy. He faithfully denounces her as the mystic Babylon of the Apocalypse, and fearlessly charges her with blasphemy, apostasy, and idolatry. How Mr. Melvill can do all this, and yet gravely contend,—directly contrary to the Homilies of his own church, that the Church of Rome is a true and apostolic church, can only be accounted for upon the principle of his having a theory to support.

Mr. Melvill does not appear to judge this question by its real merits, but by its supposed importance as affecting his own ordination. Hence he calls the Church of Rome, notwithstanding her gross idolatry, a true church, and endeavours to prop up this worthless fabric, which is doomed to destruction, for the sake of upholding his own Orders. However great a value the clergy may set upon their Orders, when viewed in connexion with an apostolical succession, it cannot be expected that the laity should attach any value to them, unless they can be traced through a purer channel than an idolatrous and anti-christian community.

Bishop Davenant observes, 'All boast about local succession is empty unless a succession of *true doctrine* be likewise proved.'—(Allport's Davenant, Vol. I. p. 20.) We shall seek in vain for this "true touchstone of a church" in apostate Rome. If there be one dogma in religion entitled to more unqualified contempt than another, it is, perhaps, the dogma of an apostolical succession derived by lineal descent, irrespective of true doctrine.—

EDITOR.

studiously and disingenuously conceals the fact, (for he can scarcely be supposed ignorant of it), that the Church of Rome sets up a thousand mediators besides Christ, thus virtually denying his Divinity, and destroying the efficacy of his atonement. This Mr. Lawson calls having "*one faith!*" As is too frequently the case with those who contend that the Church of Rome is a true Church, he connives at idolatry, and condemns all as bigots, who charge Papists with being gross idolaters. Now if we search through the annals of *Pagan* idolatry, we shall find nothing to surpass, or even equal, the gross absurdity of *Papal* idolatry. It was reserved for the priests of a *professedly* Christian Church, to make a god, in other words, create their Creator, and then eat him, for not only the humanity but the *Divinity* of Christ is said to be present in the consecrated wafer. Nor is this all. Whenever the Church of Rome possessed the power, with unrelenting cruelty she committed to the flames, all who disbelieved this monstrous and revolting doctrine of Transubstantiation, which has hence been called *the great burning article* of the Church of Rome. Can such a church be a true branch of the Christian Church? The supposition involves a glaring absurdity! The fact is, the Church of Rome does *not* believe in Christ as he is set forth in the Word of God. He is there exhibited as the only Mediator and all-sufficient Intercessor between God and man; his work is there represented as a *finished* work, and his righteousness as a *perfect* righteousness, so that true Christians are said to be "*complete in him.*" His blood cleanseth from *all* sin, for "he is able to save them to the *uttermost* that come unto God by him." The Church of England embodies all this in her truly scriptural Articles and formularies, but the

Church of Rome teaches nothing of the kind. Her whole system is constructed upon a denial of these grand fundamental verities of the Christian religion. And yet we are told by a clergyman of the Church of England, *proh pudor!* that the Church of Rome is a true Church of Christ, retaining the fundamentals of Christianity, and having one faith in common with ourselves!!—EDITOR.]

(161.)—... If the blessed Jesus, the adorable Son of God himself, be our Advocate with the Father, away with all other advocates! If He be the propitiation for our sins, away with all other intercessors! We want no angel, saint, or virgin to plead our cause, or make our heavenly Father propitious to us, since He who died for us on Mount Calvary undertakes to do it. If the well-beloved Son of God condescends to stand advocate for us, unworthy sinners as we are, at the throne of grace, we are sure his advocacy must be successful. And since we find neither command, nor instruction, nor exhortation, no, not so much as a hint, coming either from our Lord or his apostles, respecting the necessity or expediency of invoking the assistance of invisible spirits, we therefore protest against such invocation, as both *unnecessary* and *unscriptural*. We deny that the worship of these glorified beings forms any part of the Christian religion. We accuse the Church of Rome of a daring innovation, an impious corruption of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, by the introduction of such a practice. We affirm that she has no right to that name, which she has so arrogantly usurped to her, of “the holy apostolical church,” because she has forsaken the pure and undefiled religion of the Apostles, for the worship

of saints and angels. We affirm, that it is she that propagates heresy and schism, and not we: for we strive to keep close to the doctrines and practice of the Church of Christ, as established by our Lord and his inspired servants; but the Church of Rome has heretically departed from both. *We* follow the examples which St. Paul and the first Christians have set before us, of praying to God alone, through the Lord Jesus Christ, (according to the Apostle's own direction, "Be ye followers of me, as I am also of Christ"); but Romanists are not satisfied with following their example in this matter.

Do you ask us then, where our church was before the times of Henry the Eighth, or Martin Luther? We will tell you where it was: *it was in the Bible*, where it still is, and ever will be to the end of time. *The word of God* is the rock on which the Protestant Church is founded, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Luther did nothing more than help to clear away the immense mass of superstitious rubbish by which it had been so long obscured and corrupted. The Protestant Church is the Church of the Bible: the Roman Catholic Church is the church of Popes and Councils. The Protestant Church is *Apostolical*, for she follows the commands and examples of Christ and his Apostles: the Roman Catholic Church is not *Apostolical*, for she chooses rather to follow the legends of a corrupt tradition.

. . . The foundation on which the Church of Rome has erected the superstructure of saint-worship, is Tradition. All the Fathers, she asserts from the second century downwards, sanction and encourage the invocation of these angelic spirits: and so "full well she rejects the Commandments of God, that she may keep the tradition of the Fathers!" My Pro-

testant brethren, this very fact, that the Church of Rome is obliged to appeal from Scripture to the writings of the Fathers, in support of saint-worship and similar corruptions, while it clearly proves that the practice is a novelty—a human invention, introduced into the church since the days of the Apostles—is also a cause of unspeakable gratitude and joy to us, who have separated from her communion. It calls upon us to rejoice in our liberty to walk according to the precepts of God's holy word, as David says : “ I will walk at liberty, because I seek thy precepts.” It calls upon us to glory in our freedom from the trammels of a corrupt and superstitious tradition. It calls upon us to thank God that we have escaped from that unholy and servile bondage to human authority, under which our poor deluded Roman Catholic brethren are still groaning, like the Israelites under the Egyptian task-masters.

Yes, my brethren, blessed be God, the traditions of fathers, and the bulls of popes and councils, are no rules for our consciences ! Our Lord commands us to call no man, *in this sense*, our Father, or our Master, upon earth. “ Call no man,” he says, “ your father upon earth ; for one is your Father, which is in heaven.” By which he means, that we should allow no man to dictate to us, or lord it over our consciences, in religious matters ; and that, in those things which concern the salvation of our souls, we should not implicitly obey the *ipse dixit* of any man, or body of men, however venerable and learned they may be, further than as the Word of God authorizes us to do so.—*Sermon by Rev. W. F. Vance, on the Invocation of Angels, Saints, &c.* 1828.

(162.)— . . . , And herein, of all others, do our Romanists most fearfully offend, as being the authors of the most cruel schism that ever hath been seen in the Church of God. Those infamous schisms of the Novations and Donatists were but petty rents in comparison of this huge rupture, which hath pulled asunder east and west, north and south ; and grown to such a head at home, that in our western parts, were this faction was so prevalent, it hath for divers ages past been esteemed Catholic. In the 17th of the Revelation we have a *woman* described unto us sitting upon *seven mountains* and upon *many waters*. The *woman* is there expounded to be *that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth*. The *seven mountains* upon which that city sate needed not to be expounded ; every child knew what was meant thereby. The waters are interpreted *peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues*; which is that very universality and catholicism that the Romanists are wont so much to brag of. For this *woman* is the particular Church of Rome; the city-church, which they call the mother-church, the Holy Ghost styleth *the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth*. Those *peoples and multitudes, and nations, and tongues*, are such as this proud city reigneth over ; the Catholic Roman Church they are commonly called by themselves, but by the Holy Ghost the *beast* upon which the woman sitteth.

This *woman* is the head of the faction, and the very mother of this schism, the *beast* ; that is to say, they that suffer themselves to be thus ridden by her are her abettors and supporters in it. For the ‘particular Church of Rome,’ not being content to be a fellow-member with the rest of the Churches of Christ, and to have a joint dependence with them upon the whole body of the Church-Catholic, *which is the mother of*

us all, will needs go out of her rank ; and scorning any longer to be accounted one of the branches of the Catholic Church, would fain be acknowledged to be the root of it ; so that now all other churches must hold their dependence on it, or otherwise be cast forth as withered branches which are fit only to be thrown into the fire and burned. The wisdom of God foresaw this insolency long beforehand, and therefore caused a caveat to be entered against it even in that Epistle which was specially directed to the Church of Rome itself : the words are plain enough, Rom. xi. 18, *If thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.* The Church of Rome therefore must know, that she is no more a root to bear up other churches, than other churches are to bear her up ; she may not go beyond her line, and boast herself to be the root of the catholic Church, but be contented to be borne herself by the root as well as other particular churches are. For a stream to sever itself from the common fountain, that it may be counted a fountain itself without dependence upon any other, is the next way to make an end of it and dry it up. The Church of Rome may do well to think of this, and leave off her vain boasting, *I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow* : other churches may fail, and the gates of hell may prevail against them ; but it cannot fall out so with me. Whereas she might remember, that they were Romans unto whom the apostle so long since gave this admonition : *Be not high-minded, but fear ; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God : on them which fell, severity ; but towards thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness : otherwise THOU ALSO SHALT BE CUT OFF.*

The Romans therefore by their pride may get a fall

as well as others; and the Church of Rome by infidelity may be cut off as well as any other congregation; and yet the Catholic Church subsist for all that, as having for her foundation neither Rome nor Rome's bishop, but Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. And yet this proud dame and her daughters, the particular Church of Rome I mean, and that which they call the Catholic Roman, or the faction rather that prevaieth in them both, have in these latter ages confined the whole Church of Christ within themselves, and excluded all others that were under the Roman obedience, as *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise*. The Donatists were cried out against by our forefathers for shutting up the church within the parts of the south, and rejecting all others that held not correspondency with that patch of theirs: and could they think then well of them that should conclude the church within the western parts of the world, and exclude all other Christians from the body of Christ that held by the same root there that they did? It is a strange thing to me, that wise men should make such large discourses of the Catholic Church, and bring so many testimonies to prove the universality of it, and not discern, that while by this means they think they have gotten a great victory over us, they have in very truth overthrown themselves; for when it cometh to the point, instead of the Catholic Church, which consisteth of the communion of all nations, they obtrude their own piece unto us, circumscribing the Church of Christ within the precincts of the Romish jurisdiction, and leaving all the world beside to the power of Satan; for with them it is a resolved case, that 'to every creature it is altogether of necessity to salvation to be subject to the Roman Bishop.'

What must, then become of the poor Muscovites and Grecians, to say nothing of the reformed churches in Europe? What of the Egyptian, and Ethiopian churches in Africa? What of the great companies of Christians scattered over all Asia, even from Constantinople unto the East Indies, which have and still do endure more afflictions and pressures for the name of Christ, than they have ever done that would be accounted the only friends of Christ? Must these because they are not the pope's subjects, be therefore denied to be Christ's subjects? Because they are not under the obedience of the Roman Church, do they therefore forfeit the estate which they claim in the Catholic Church, out of which there is no salvation? Must we give all these for gone, and conclude that they are certainly damned? They who talk so much of the Catholic Church, but indeed stand for their own particular, must of force sink as low in uncharitableness as they have thrust themselves deep in schism; we who talk less of the universality of the church, but hold the truth of it, cannot find in our hearts to pass such a bloody sentence upon so many poor souls that have given their names to Christ. He whose pleasure it was to spread the church's seed so far, said to east, west, north, and south, Give; it is not for us, then, to say, Keep back. He hath given to his Son *the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession!* we for our parts dare not abridge this grant, and limit this great lordship, as we conceive it may best fit our own turns; but leave it to its own latitude, and seek for the Catholic Church neither in this part, nor in that piece, but, as it hath been before said in the words of the apostle, among all *that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.*

. . . . It is most true indeed that in the church there is *one Lord, one faith, one baptism*; for so we are taught by the apostle . . . but yet, in the *first place*, it is to be considered, that this *unity of faith* must be compassed by such means as God hath ordained for the procuring of it, and not by any politic tricks of man's devising. . . . It is *the unity of the spirit* which the apostle here speaketh of, and exhorteth us to keep in the bond of peace. Whereas the unity of which our adversaries boast so much (which is nothing else but a wilful suffering of themselves to be led blindfold by one man, who commonly is more blind, than many of themselves) is no fruit of the spirit, but of mere carnal policy; and may serve peradventure for a *bond of peace* betwixt themselves and their own party, such as the priests of *Antichrist* were to have, and as many as would be content to yield themselves to the conduct of such a commander, but hath proved the greatest block that ever stood in the way for giving impediment to the peace and unity of the universal church, which here we look after.—*Archbishop Usher's Sermon on the Universality of the Church of Christ. See Answer to a Jesuit, &c. Cambridge, 1835, p. 696, 700.*

(163.)— . . . Remission of sins by the blood of Jesus is the *whole foundation of the hope of man's salvation which Christianity supplies*. Take it away, and the sun drops from the system, and all is outer darkness, desolation, despair, and death. Thus it is in the unhappy Church of Rome—salvation by Christ is gone from her, and thick darkness, guilt, and death broods over every cavern of her superstition—she assumes it as a fact, that the Lord Jesus Christ has *not made atonement for sin*. This dark and deep denial of

the salvation proclaimed by God to man is that on which her every ordinance is built. In every single question and answer which I have quoted from her catechism, she either expressly or by implication denies the atonement of Immanuel.—*Truth and Error contrasted by Rev. R. J. M'Ghee.* p. 79.

(164.)—What, said Luther, is the hinge on which the whole controversy between Protestantism and Popery turns? It is, he responded, the doctrine of Justification by Faith.

(165.)—. . . The Scripture is alone to constitute that rule whereby we are to walk—The Scripture rightly and soundly interpreted. This is to form the rule of our faith and practice; and this indeed does form a rule worthy of a rational being subject to a providential government, inasmuch as it secures to us, at the same time, the guidance of those two great lights, which our Heavenly Father has graciously placed in the moral firmament for our direction, the lights of revelation and of reason, of which neither was designed to supersede the other, much less could it ever have been the will of him who is the Father of these lights, that we should abdicate the benefits of both. We are neither with the Socinian, to enslave revelation to reason; nor yet with the Enthusiast, to reject reason in judging of revelation; and least of all, are we with the followers of the Church of Rome, to close our eyes against the light both of the one and of the other. But we are, by the sober and cautious exercise of a well-informed reason to authenticate and to interpret the word of revelation. We are, in truth, to govern

ourselves by the principle on which our reformed faith has been erected. We are to build upon that foundation, which we are told is the only true one that can be laid—the foundation of Jesus Christ.

. . . But in truth Christianity and Popery are in many points at fatal variance. The Papal Church consists of all who hold communion with the pope. The Christian Church consists of all who hold communion with Christ. The rule of faith for the members of the former are the decrees of man; the rule of faith for the members of the latter is the Word of God.

The means whereby the former would guide its followers are the closing up of scripture, and shutting out the light of reason: the means employed by the latter, the unfolding of the sacred volume to our daily and hourly meditation, and the inviting us to the exercise of our best powers in deriving from it a knowledge of the divine will; earnestly encouraging us to try the spirits whether they be of God, and to be careful to prove all things and hold fast that which is good.—*Sermon by Archbishop Magee. Reported in Christian Guardian, May, 1827.*

(166.)—You (Mr. Charles Butler) are angry at the charge of wilful fraud, which has been brought against your church, and assert from Mr. Alban Butler, that the Church of Rome never as a body, sanctioned frauds and forgeries, but severely condemned them. It is certain that no body of men will publicly defend such monstrous practices as these, neither would the corrupt conduct of the clergy, in an ignorant and superstitious age, become a fair argument in the present instance; if you and your friends would no longer adduce these supposed and asserted miracles, as evidences that the

Church of Rome, is the only true church. If, however, you will still believe them, and require us to believe them also; we are right in examining the evidences on which they rest. When this is done, we reject them, and pronounce them *frauds, forgeries, and impostures*. The inquirers for truth must determine between your belief, and our decision. *Accusations of History against the Church of Rome* by Rev. G. Townsend, p. 44.

(167.)— . . . You must be acquainted with the table of impositions of the chancery of Rome, published by Anthony Egane, the confessor-general of Ireland after his conversion to Protestantism. Do the parchment and the wax, or do the words of the dispensation cost most, when the pardon of a heretic is charged at £36. 9s., than when the marrying of one wife, after murdering another, is charged at £8. 2s. 9d.? Protestants either do not know, or they cannot believe, even the possibility, much more the certainty of the crimes of which your church has been guilty. Yet *this monstrous system of iniquity and soul-murder* is palliated and advocated in the nineteenth century!—*Ibid.* p. 130.

(168.)— . . . In another place, I have called popery '*the enslaver and curse of mankind,*' and the most deliberate survey of the state of Europe, justifies the severity of my expression.—*Ibid.* p. 490.

(169.)— You complain, Sir, that I treat the miracles of your church with contempt and ridicule: it would be well if they called forth no other feeling in a sincere

and ingenuous mind ! You tell me that a Roman Catholic may disbelieve them all without ceasing to be a Roman Catholic : and you ask, ‘ if it be either just or generous to harass the present Catholics with the weaknesses of the ancient writers of their communion, and to attempt to render their religion and themselves odious by these unceasing and offensive repetitions ? ’ Is it quite consistent, Sir, thus to cry mercy upon this part of your case, and yet to rely at one time upon the very fables which you abandon at another ? For you boast of a perpetual succession of miracles in the Romish Church, as a perpetual proof that it is the true one. You give them up in the detail, and appeal to them in the gross. This is something like your proposed rule of controversy, and your Maynooth rule of faith, in which we are told that you are not required to believe in the saints whose names are in your kalendar, whose churches and whose altars you attend, whose relics and whose images you venerate, whose festivals you keep, and whose legends make a part of your liturgy. Methinks, Sir, this manner of playing fast and loose with opinions, of advancing at one time what you have renounced at another, as may happen to suit the bearing of your immediate argument, savours rather of law than of logic ; it belongs to the practices of perverted subtlety, not to the use of right reason. The subterfuges of disputation are always unworthy ; they are especially misplaced when we are looking for the realities of historical and religious truth.

This, Sir, is your position ; ‘ that if Roman Catholics prove a constant succession of *miracles* in their church, they consequently establish the truth of her doctrine.’ Now, I advance as a position, not less certain, that if Protestants prove a constant succession of *frauds* in

that church, the papal system is what I have pronounced it to be . . . **A PRODIGIOUS STRUCTURE OF IMPOSTURE AND WICKEDNESS.** You have said that the words superstition and idolatry are the burthen of the book of the church : if they are not the burthen of the present volume, it is because one that will be even less palatable, must more frequently be used. Superstition and idolatry call as much for pity as for condemnation, but there is nothing to qualify our detestation of imposture ; and if I do not substantiate that charge upon the Romish church, let me be held for a calumniator by posterity !—*Southey's Letters to Butler*, p. 95.

(170.)— . . . He (Archbishop Leighton) then spoke of popery in the complex at much another rate : and he seemed to have more zeal against it, than I thought was in his nature with relation to any points in controversy ; for his abstraction made him seem cold in all these matters. But he gave all who conversed with him a very different view of popery, when he saw we were really in danger of coming under the power of a religion, ' that had,' as he used to say, ' much of the wisdom that was earthly, sensual, and devilish, but nothing in it of the wisdom that was from above, and was pure and peaceable.' He did indeed think the corruptions and cruelties of popery were such gross and odious things, that nothing could have maintained that church under these just and visible prejudices, but the several orders among them, which had an appearance of mortification and contempt of the world, and with all that trash that was among them, maintained a face of piety and devotion.

. . . He was in his last years turned to a greater

severity against popery than I had imagined a man of his temper, and of his largeness in point of opinion, was capable. He spoke of the corruptions of the secular spirit and of the cruelty that appeared in the Romish Church, with an extraordinary concern, and lamented the shameful advances which we seemed to be making towards popery. He did this with a tenderness (soreness) and an edge, which I did not expect from so recluse and mortified a man.—*Life of Archbishop Leighton, by Rev. E. Middleton. Prefixed to Leighton's Works, vol. i.*

(171.)—By that which is spoken of him (Peter) in divers passages of the Gospel, he is very remarkable amongst the apostles, both for his graces and his failings; eminent in zeal and courage, yet stumbling oft in his forwardness, and once grossly falling: and these by the providence of God being recorded in Scripture, give a check to the excess of Rome's conceit concerning this apostle. Their extolling and exalting him above the rest, is not for his cause, and much less to the honour of his Lord and Master Jesus Christ, for he is injured and dishonoured by it; but it is in favour of themselves, as Alexander distinguished his two friends, that the one was a friend of Alexander, and the other a friend of the king. That preferment they give this Apostle, is not in good will to *Peter*, but in the desire of the *primacy*. But whatsoever he was, they would be much in pain to prove Rome's right to it by succession. And if ever it had any such right, we may confidently say, it has forfeited it long ago, by departing from St. Peter's footsteps, and from his faith, and retaining too much those things wherein he was faulty, namely, His unwillingness to hear of and consent to

Christ's sufferings,—his *Master, spare thyself*, or, *Far be it from thee*, in those they are like him : for thus they would disburden and exempt the church from the cross, from the real cross of afflictions, and instead of that have nothing but painted or carved or gilded crosses, these they are content to embrace, and worship too, but cannot endure to hear of the other. Instead of the cross of affliction, they make the crown or mitre the badge of their church, and will have it known by prosperity and outward pomp ; and so turn the church militant into the church triumphant, not considering that it is *Babylon's voice*, not the church's, *I sit as a queen and shall see no sorrow*.

Again, they are like him in his saying on the mount at Christ's transfiguration, when he knew not what he said, *It is good to be here* : so they have little of the true glory of Christ, but the false glory of that monarchy on their seven hills ; *It is good to be here*, say they.

Again, in their undue striking with the sword, not the enemies, as he, but the faithful friends and servants of Jesus Christ. But to proceed, we see here Peter's office or title, an apostle, *not chief Bishop*. Some in their glossing have been so impudent, as to add that beside the text, though chap. v. 4, he gives that title to Christ alone, and to himself only *fellow-elder*, and here, not prince of the Apostles, but an Apostle, restored and re-established after his fall by repentance, and by Christ himself after his own death and resurrection, John xxi.—*Archbishop Leighton on Peter*, ch. i. ver. 1.

(172.)— . . . Against Popery she (the Church of England) is solemnly pledged to witness. Her Arti-

cles, Homilies, and formularies ; her whole framework, tone, and texture, pledge her to give no quarter to that mystery of iniquity. And had her watchmen been faithful to the charge she gave them, we should never have had our once fettered foe again scaling our ramparts and thundering at our towers. My brethren, it behoves every churchman to be ascertained why he is a Protestant member of a Protestant Church. It behoves every clergyman especially, to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the grounds upon which we cast off the usurpation of Rome, and restored our Church to somewhat of her primeval simplicity and freedom. It behoves all our ministers to be upon their watchtowers, and to guard their people against the insidious encroachments of an enemy, which is not only invading us from without, but which, in a subtle disguise, may be said to be stealing upon us from within.—*Sermon by Rev. Hugh Stowell. Preached before Prayer-Book and Homily Society, p. 11.*

(173.)—It is, perhaps, impossible, in the very nature of things, that such another scheme as Popery could be invented. It is, in truth, *the Mystery of iniquity* ; that it should be able to work itself into the simple, grand, sublime, holy institution of Christianity ; and so to interweave its abominations with the truth, as to occupy the strongest passions of the soul, and to controul the strongest understanding ! While Pascal can speak of Popery as he does, its influence over the mass of the people can excite no surprise. Those two master principles—That we must believe as the Church ordains, and, That there is no salvation out of this Church—oppose, in the ignorance and fear which they beget, an almost insuperable barrier against the truth.

. . . Popery was the MASTER-PIECE of Satan. I believe him utterly incapable of such another contrivance. It was a systematic and infallible plan, for forming manacles and mufflers for the human mind. It was a well laid design to render Christianity contemptible, by the abuse of its principles and institutions. It was formed to overwhelm—to enchant—to sit as the great Whore, making the Earth drunk with her fornications.—*Cecil's Remains*, 1821, p. 152.

(174.)—*A Beast* is the emblem of an idolatrous and oppressive empire; the Roman Empire was 'the Beast' under the Pagan Emperors: it ceased to be so, when it became Christian, with reference to which the angel says, by way of anticipation, "It is not." Yet it would afterwards "ascend out of the abyss:" that is, when the Antichristian Empire became idolatrous and persecuting, and the Dragon gave his power to the Beast, it seemed to arise out of the sea, the tempestuous state of the nations; but it was in fact from hell, being *Satan's grand scheme for opposing the Gospel*, and therefore after a time it would go into perdition, and be destroyed finally and for ever.—*Scott's Commentary*, Rev. xvii. 7, 8.

(175.)—. . . Who is this, that forgiveth sins, except God only? and, who is this, that also dispenses with the most solemn moral obligations? Is he not Antichrist, shewing himself that he is God? On this and some other occasions, I choose to give the very expressions of the papal bulls, as a sufficient confutation of the sophisms by which some modern writers have endeavoured to palliate or do away the crimes

of the popedom. The language indeed of our early protestant writers against popery is severe beyond measure; but it hardly could be equal to the desert of those whom they opposed.—*Milner's Church History*, Vol. III. p. 491.

(176.)—The Rev. A. S. Thelwall in a speech delivered at a Meeting of the Protestant Association, May 9, 1838, remarked that every thing which is good and pure in the *true* Church, was counterfeited and caricatured in the *false* church, and referred to the spurious charity that would not allow us to speak of Popery in the language it deserved. He observed that we need not use stronger language than is used in the Scriptures in speaking of Popery, and referred to 2 Thess. ii. and to the Apocalypse, wherein Popery is described as a blood-stained harlot, sitting on a many coloured beast covered with names of blasphemy. He also recommended the audience to study well the Homilies of the Church of England, particularly the 5th, 10th, and 14th. Whether Popery was considered as a religious or political system, no terms were too strong to set forth its diabolical character.—*See Record*, May 17, 1838.

(177.)—It had fallen to his lot in his intercourse with society to mix with many in high stations, and he was frequently asked this question by many such, ‘Is not Popery very much vilified? Are not all those attacks made upon her very severe?’ To this he would answer that if holding her up in her true colours; and in her real character, was to vilify her, she was indeed very much vilified, and that the attacks

made upon her were no doubt severe, but they were deserved, and many punishments were not the less deserved for being severe. He had been also asked from the same quarters whether he believed that such men as Fenelon, Massilon, and Thomas a Kempis, were saved? He answered that he certainly believed they were; but then it was because they were not true to that system to which they nominally adhered. It was in spite of,—not because of their religion.*—*Speech of Rev. H. H. Beamish at a Meeting of the Irish Society of London, May, 1838.*

(178.)— . . . He would now address a few remarks to a class of Christians, whose amiable feelings, and

* If the Church of Rome is the mystic Babylon of the Apocalypse as all sound Protestants concur in believing, the circumstance of some of God's people remaining in her communion instead of obeying the injunction—"Come out of her my people;" neither alters her character, nor proves her to be a true church. There doubtless are some individuals within her pale who refuse to participate in her idolatrous practices, but this is no proof that she is not an idolatrous church. All we can say of such persons is, that they are not true and consistent members of their own church; and it is upon this ground alone that we rest our hopes of their salvation, for if they believe and trust in such refuges of lies as their church offers them, instead of the saving truths of the Gospel, we can have no scriptural warrant for their safety.

That is a spurious sort of liberality which induces some persons to say, *without any qualification*,—"We have no doubt that many thousands of Roman Catholics will be saved." The question is, do they believe, contrary to 1 Cor. vi. 9, that many thousands of idolaters will be saved? The Church of Rome is a grossly idolatrous church as will be seen by a reference to numerous extracts in this volume, (See Extracts under Idolatry, passim.) It follows, therefore, if Romanists are true to their own religion, they must necessarily be gross idolaters.—EDITOR.

imperfect knowledge, both of Romanism and of the essentials of their own faith, led them to repudiate the charges that were brought against Romish doctrines and ceremonies, and to censure the severity with which these were arraigned, and even sometimes to contribute towards the erection of Romish Chapels. The persons to whom he alluded were pained at the notion that so many millions of their countrymen were immersed in idolatry, and they feared that we exceeded the bounds of a just moderation, when we boldly condemned the Romish system as superstitious, idolatrous, and anti-christian. They told us to beware how we accused a church of such delinquencies, whose origin was apostolic, which had an unbroken succession of bishops, which professed to worship the same God, and which laid great claim to holiness. To this he would reply that in the scriptures we found the exact counterpart of all those pretensions. The Jewish church before the captivity, professed to worship the true God; called themselves the temple of the Lord: said,—‘stand out of the way, for we are holier than thou,’ and wearied God with the multitude of their burnt offerings and sacrifices, and nevertheless offered incense to the Queen of Heaven, and were plunged in the grossest idolatry. At our Saviour’s advent, the Jews similarly made the greatest pretensions to holiness; they thanked God that were not like the poor publican; that they made broad their phylacteries; they made many prayers, and fasted often, and looked contemptuously upon the heathen, they constituted what the Church of Rome never has done, and never will do, the only visible church; they possessed the oracles of God, their high priest entered the holiest as the type of Christ; their origin as a church was divine; they had an unbroken succession in the priesthood, and yet they were

in a state of the most awful apostacy, and they crucified the Redeemer. The lofty pretensions of the Romish Church availed her nothing. The temple did not consecrate the religion; it was true religion which sanctified the temple. If Protestants were deemed liable to deceive themselves or to exaggerate, could the same be said of a Cranmer, a Ridley, a Latimer, or a Hooper, who were all born and bred Roman Catholics, and were perfectly conversant with the Romish Creed? They, far from thinking lightly of her errors, preferred the faggot to recantation, and esteemed a cruel death, preferable to being again polluted by her abominations.—*From a speech of Mr. Finch's at a meeting of the British Reformation Society, May, 1838.*

(179.)—The papists, . . . do at this day hate us deadly and condemn our doctrine as wicked and erroneous; yea moreover, they lie in wait for our goods and lives; and we again do, with a perfect hatred, detest and condemn their cursed and blasphemous doctrine. . . . Mark here diligently that every teacher of works and of the righteousness of the law, is a troubler of the church, and of the consciences of men. And who would ever have believed that the pope, cardinals, bishops, monks, and that whole synagogue of Satan, specially, the founders of those religious orders (of which number, nevertheless God might save some by miracle) were troublers of men's consciences? Yea verily they be far worse than were those false apostles; for the false apostles taught, that, besides faith in Christ, the works of the law of God were also necessary to salvation: but the papists, omitting faith, have taught men's traditions and works not commanded of God, but devised by themselves without and against

the Word of God : and these have they not only made equal with the Word of God, but also exalted them far above it.

. . . It seemeth to be a light matter to mingle the law and the gospel, faith and works together ; but it doth more mischief than a man's reason can conceive ; for it doth not only blemish and darken the knowledge of grace, but also it taketh away Christ, with all his benefits, and it utterly overthroweth the gospel.—*Luther's Commentary on the Galatians*, ch. i. v. 7.

(180.)—It is perfectly true that popery has been sometimes attacked in an unjustifiable spirit ; and yet, when we think of its manifold crimes ; and of the injuries and insults which it has inflicted upon the bodies and souls of men, we can well understand why it should have aroused the strongest feelings of philanthropists, patriots, and Christians. In reading Luther, we get angry at his warmth, but when we close the page, and reflect upon the arts and frauds of Rome—from her doctrinal heresies to her practical corruptions ; from her debasing superstitions and sacrilegious inventions, to the racks and inquisitions by which she upheld them—no language, that is not unbecoming a Christian to use, appears too severe to express the abhorrence of a virtuous and godly mind at the contemplation of such enormities ; no language certainly can be stronger than that of Holy Writ in predicting them.—*Christian Observer*, 1837. p. 184.

(181.)— . . . I believe the line of no man's existence is long enough to sound the unfathomable depths of papal iniquity. I humbly trust, Sir, that the attention

of all who value the blessings of true religion may be roused to the subject, and that all may feel it their duty, in their respective spheres, to use their humble efforts to deliver our poor fellow-subjects and fellow-sinners from the fangs of that Antichristian apostasy.—*Rev. R. M'Ghee's Letter to Editor of Christian Observer, March, 1838.*

(182.)—The corruptions, doctrinal and practical of the Romish Church were in these (the dark) ages, at their height. They are studiously kept out of view by the writers who still maintain the infallibility of that church; and in truth, that a system, in all things so unlike the religion of the Gospel, and so opposite to its spirit, should have been palmed upon the world, and established as Christianity, would be incredible, if the proofs were not undeniable and abundant.

. . . That authority, to which the church could lay no claim for the purity of its members, it supported by its arrogant pretensions, availing itself of all notions, accidents, practices, and frauds, from which any advantage could be derived, till the whole monstrous accumulation assumed a coherent form, which well deserves to be called the mystery of iniquity. . . . In maintenance of the dominant system, Tradition, or the unwritten word, was set up. This had been the artifice of some of the earliest heretics, who, when they were charged with holding doctrines not according to Scripture, affirmed that some things had been revealed which were not committed to writing, but were orally transmitted down. The Pharisees, before them, pleaded the same supposititious authority for the formalities which they superadded to the law, and by which they sometimes superseded it, 'making the word of God

of none effect,' as our Saviour himself reproached them. And upon this ground the Romish clergy justified all the devices of man's imagination with which they had corrupted the ritual and the faith of the western church. One of the earliest corruptions grew out of the reverence which was paid to the memory of departed saints. Hence there arose a train of error and fraud, which ended in the grossest creature-worship.

. . . At one time, relics or entire bodies used to be carried about the country and exhibited to the credulous multitude; but this gainful practice gave occasion to such scandalous impostures, that it was at length suppressed. What was still encouraged is sufficiently disgraceful to the Romanists.

. . . With the reverence which was paid to relics, arising thus naturally at first, and converted by crafty priests into a source of lucre, saint-worship grew up. . . . They were invoked as mediators between God and man; individuals claimed the peculiar protection of those whose names they had received in baptism, and towns and kingdoms chose each their tutelary saint. . . . The virtue which they possessed they imparted to their images, in which indeed it was affirmed that they were really and potentially present, partaking of ubiquity in their beatitude. For the monks and clergy promoted every fantastic theory, and every vulgar superstition, that could be made gainful to themselves; and devised arguments for them, which they maintained with all the subtleties of scholastic logic. Having thus introduced a polytheism little less gross than that of the heathens, and an actual idolatry, they hung about their altars (as had also been the custom in heathen temples,) pictures recording marvellous deliverances, and waxen models of the diseased or injured

parts, which had been healed by the saint to whose honour they were there suspended. Church vied with church, and convent with convent, in the reputation of their wonder-working images, some of which were pretended to have been made without hands, and some to have descended from heaven! But the rivalry of the monastic orders was shown in the fictions wherewith they filled the histories of their respective founders and worthies. No language can exaggerate the enormity of the falsehoods which were thus promulgated, nor the spirit of impious audacity in which they were conceived; yet some of the most monstrous and most palpably false, received the full sanction of the papal authority; the superstitions founded upon them were legitimated by papal bulls; and festivals in commemoration of miracles which never happened,—nay, worse than this,—of the most blasphemous and flagitious impostures, were appointed in the Romish Kalendar, where at this day they hold their place. While the monastic orders contended with each other in exaggerating the fame of their deified patriarchs, each claimed the Virgin Mary for its especial patroness. Some peculiar favour she had bestowed upon each. She had appointed their rule of life, or devised the pattern of their habit; or enjoined them some new practice of devotion, or granted them some singular privilege. She had espoused their founder with a ring, or fed him like a babe at her breast!—(it is fitting, and necessary that this abominable system of imposture should be displayed:)—and each of the popular orders had been assured by revelation, that the place in heaven for its departed members was under her skirts. All therefore united in elevating her to the highest rank in the mythology of the Romish Church,

for so in strict truth must this enormous system of fable be designated.

. . . Her image was to be found in every church throughout Christendom ; and she was worshipped under innumerable appellations. As an example of the falsehoods by which this superstition was kept up, it may suffice to mention the brave legend of Loretto, where the house in which the Virgin lived at Nazareth is still shown, as having been carried there by four angels. The story of its arrival, and how it had been set down twice upon the way, and how it was ascertained to be the genuine house, both by miracles, and by the testimony of persons sent to examine the spot where it was originally built, and to measure the foundations, . . . received the sanction of successive popes, and was printed in all languages, for pilgrims of every Christian nation, who were attracted thither by the celebrity of the shrine, and by the indulgences promised to those who should visit it in devotion.

By such representations and fables, the belief of the people became so entirely corrupted, that Christ, instead of being regarded as our Mediator and Redeemer, appeared to them in the character of a jealous God, whom it behoved them to propitiate through the mediation of his Virgin Mother, for through her alone could mercy and salvation be obtained. Prayers were addressed to her as our life and hope, our advocate and mediatrix, who was to reconcile us to her Son. The pantheon, which Agrippa had dedicated to Jupiter and all the gods, was by the pope, who converted it into a church, inscribed to the blessed Virgin and all the saints. Nor was it in idolatry, polytheism, and creature-worship alone, that the resemblance was apparent between the religion of pagan and of papal

Rome. The priests of the Roman church had gradually fallen into many of the rites and ceremonies of their heathen predecessors, profiting in some cases by what was useful, in others not improperly conforming to what was innocent, but in too many points culpably imitating pernicious and abominable usages.

. . . If the boundless credulity of mankind be a mournful subject for consideration, as in truth it is, it is yet more mournful to observe the profligate wickedness with which that credulity has been abused. The Church of Rome appears to have delighted in insulting as well as in abusing it, and to have pleased itself with discovering how far it was possible to subdue and degrade the human intellect, as an eastern despot measures his own greatness by the servile prostration of his subjects. If farther proof than has already appeared were needful, it would be found in the prodigious doctrine of transubstantiation. This astonishing doctrine arose from taking figurative words in a literal sense, and the Romanists do not shrink from the direct inference, that if their interpretation be just, Christ took his own body in his own hands, and offered it to his disciples. But all minor difficulties may easily be overlooked, when the flagrant absurdity of the doctrine itself is regarded. For, according to the Church of Rome, when the words of consecration have been pronounced, the bread becomes that same actual body of flesh and blood in which our Lord and Saviour suffered upon the cross; remaining bread to the sight, touch, and taste, yet ceasing to be so. . . . And into how many parts soever the bread may be broken, the whole entire body is contained in every part. And this, they pretend, is that daily bread for which our Saviour has instructed us to pray!

. . . Strange as it may appear, the doctrine had

become popular, . . . with the people, for its very extravagance, . . . with the clergy, because they grounded upon it their loftiest pretensions. For if there were in the sacrament this actual and entire sole presence, which they denoted by the term of transubstantiation, it followed that divine worship was something more than a service of prayer and thanksgiving; an actual sacrifice was performed in it, wherein they affirmed the Saviour was again offered up, in the same body which had suffered on the cross, by their hands. The priest, when he performed this stupendous function of his ministry, had before his eyes, and held in his hands, the Maker of heaven and earth; and the inference which they deduced from so blasphemous an assumption was, that the clergy were not to be subject to any secular authority, seeing that they could create God their Creator! Let it not be supposed that the statement is in the slightest part exaggerated, it is delivered faithfully in their own words.

If such then were the power of the clergy, even of the meanest priest, what must be attributed to their earthly head, the successor of St. Peter? They claimed for him a plenitude of power; and it has been seen that he exercised it over the princes of Christendom in its fullest meaning. According to the Canonists, the pope was as far above all kings, as the sun is greater than the moon. He was king of kings, and lord of lords, though he subscribed himself the servant of servants. His power it was which was intended, when it was said to the prophet Jeremiah, "Behold, I have this day set thee over the nations and the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." It was an incomprehensible and infinite power, because "great is the Lord, and great is his power, and of his greatness there is no end." The

immediate and sole rule of the whole world belonged to him by natural, moral, and divine right ; all authority depending upon him. As supreme king, he might impose taxes upon all Christians ; and the popes declared it was to be held as a point necessary to salvation, that every human creature is subject to the Roman pontiff. That he might lawfully depose kings, was avered to be so certain a doctrine that it could only be denied by mad men, or through the instigation of the devil ; it was more pernicious and intolerable to deny it, than to err concerning the sacraments. And, indeed, God would not have sufficiently provided for the preservation of his church and the safety of souls, if he had not appointed this power of depriving or restraining apostate princes. All nations and kingdoms were under the pope's jurisdiction, for to him God had delivered over the power and dominion in heaven and earth. Nay, he might take away kingdoms and empires, with or without cause, and give them to whom he pleased, though the sovereign whom he should depose were in every respect not merely blameless, but meritorious : it was reason enough for the change that the pope deemed it convenient. The spouse of the church was vice-god : men were commanded to bow at his name, as at the name of Christ ; the proudest sovereigns waited upon him like menials, led his horse by the bridle, and held his stirrup while he alighted ; and there were ambassadors, who prostrated themselves before him, saying, ' O thou, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us ! '

... Even this monstrous proposition has been advanced, that although the Catholic Faith teaches all virtue to be good, and all vice evil ; nevertheless, if the Pope, through error, should enjoin vices to be

committed, and prohibit virtues, the church would be bound to believe that vices were good, and virtues evil, and would sin in conscience were it to believe otherwise. He could change the nature of things and make injustice justice. Nor was it possible that he should be amenable to any secular power, for he had been called God by Constantine, and God was not to be judged by man: under God, the salvation of all the faithful depended on him, and the commentators even gave him the blasphemous appellation of our Lord God the Pope! It was disputed in the schools, whether he could not abrogate what the apostles had enjoined, determine an opinion contrary to theirs, and add a new article to the Creed; whether he did not, as God, participate both natures with Christ, and whether he were not more merciful than Christ, inasmuch as he delivered souls from the pains of purgatory, whereas we did not read that this had ever been done by our Saviour. Lastly, it was affirmed, that he might do things unlawful and thus could do more than God! All this was certain, because the church was infallible. Where this infallibility resided, the Romanists have differed among themselves, some vesting it in the Pope, others requiring the concurrence of a General Council. Infallible, however, it was determined that the Roman Catholic Church must be, and thus the key-stone was put to this prodigious structure of imposture and wickedness—*The Book of the Church, by R. Southey, Esq., L. L. D. Fourth Edition, p. 169—191.*

(183.—This conclusion, that *the Pope is Antichrist*, and that other, that *the scripture is the sole rule of Christian faith*, were the two great principles, on which the Reformation was originally founded. How

the *first* of these principles came to be disgraced among ourselves, I have shewn in another discourse (Sermon viii.) It may now be worth while to observe, in one word, through what fatal mismanagement the *latter* principle was even generally disavowed and deserted.

When the Reformers had thrown off all respect for the Papal chair, and were for regulating the faith of Christians by the sacred scriptures, it still remained a question, *On what grounds, those scriptures should be interpreted.* The voice of the church, speaking by her schoolmen, and modern doctors, was universally, and without much ceremony, rejected. But the fathers of the primitive church were still in great repute among Protestants themselves; who dreaded nothing so much as the imputation of novelty, which they saw would be fastened on their opinions, and who, besides, thought it too presuming to trust entirely to the dictates of what was called the *private spirit*. The Church of Rome availed herself with dexterity, of this prejudice, and of the distress to which the Protestant party was reduced by it. The authority of these antient and venerable interpreters was sounded high by the Catholic writers; and the clamour was so great and so popular, that the Protestants knew not how, consistently with their own principles, or even in mere decency, to decline the appeal which was thus confidently made to that tribunal. The Reformers, too, piqued themselves on their superior skill in antient literature; and were ashamed to have it thought that their adversaries could have any advantage against them in a dispute, which was to be carried on in that quarter. Other considerations had, perhaps, their weight with particular churches: but for these reasons, chiefly, all of them forwardly closed in with the proposal of trying their cause at the bar

of the antient church : and, thus, shifting their ground, maintained henceforth, not that the scriptures were the sole rule of faith, but the scriptures, *as interpreted by the primitive fathers.*

When the state of the question was thus changed, it was easy to see what would be the issue of so much indiscretion. The dispute was not only carried on in a dark and remote scene, into which the people could not follow their learned champions ; but was rendered infinitely tedious, and, indeed, interminable. For those early writings, now to be considered as of the highest authority, were voluminous in themselves ; and, what was worse, were composed in so loose, so declamatory, and often in so hyberbolical a strain, that no certain sense could be affixed to their doctrines, and any thing, or every thing, might, with some plausibility, be proved from them.

The inconvenience was sensibly felt by the Protestant world. And, after a prodigious waste of industry and erudition, a learned foreigner, (M. Daillé) at length shewed the inutility and the folly of pursuing the contest any further. In a well-considered discourse, *On the use of the Fathers*, he clearly evinced, that their authority was much less, than was generally supposed, in *all* points of religious controversy ; and that their judgment was especially incompetent in *those* points which were agitated by the two parties. He evinced this conclusion by a variety of unanswerable arguments ; and chiefly by shewing that the matters in debate were, for the most part, such as had never entered into the heads of those old writers, being indeed, of much later growth, and having first sprung up in the barbarous ages. They could not, therefore, decide on questions, which they had no occasion to consider, and had, in fact, never considered ; however

their careless or figurative expression might be made to look that way, by the dexterous management of the controversialists.

This discovery had great effects. It opened the eyes of the more candid and intelligent inquirers; and our incomparable Chillingworth with some others, took the advantage of it to set the controversy with the Church of Rome, once more on its proper foot; and to establish, for ever the old principle, **THAT THE BIBLE, and that only, (interpreted by our best reason) IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS.***—*Bishop Hurd on the Prophecies, 1772, p. 420—425.*

(184.)—At this town (Dunkirk) some of the peasants we talked with, actually called the Protestants Jews, confounding them indiscriminately with all who reject the Roman Catholic faith. The adoration paid to the image of the Virgin Mary quite appals the mind; the worship of our Saviour is comparatively forgotten. In fact, the Virgin seems almost to engross the veneration of the Papist, and to supersede every thing else.

. . . We came on Friday to Courtray, a beautiful neat town; but alas! the whole place seemed given up to superstition. Lamps are suspended throughout the streets before the images of the Virgin, as if she were a guardian deity. In England we have little idea of the state of things in Catholic Europe, or of our own blessings.

. . . What a contrast is there between the magnificent pulpits and the mean and unworthy tenets in-

* Since the Oxford Tract writers broached their pernicious heresy, the Editor has heard two individuals calling themselves clergymen of our Protestant Church, openly assail from the pulpit this noble sentiment of Chillingworth's.

THE CHURCH OF ROME

... and picking away, that now
... converted into a new guise.

... with our Saviour Christ pro-
... Pharisees in the Gospel;
... with safe conscience pro-
... namely, that they
... the command-
... their own constitu-
... all they which
... confess, we
... of Augustine,
... are not
... to be taken as
... However, saith
... concerning the
... where the
... church :
... the Church

—————

... faith-
... and every
... commanded,
... of
... before
... com-
... it was
... state of
... gully,
... and
... com-
... the
... state

...family of ...
The foregoing ...
words have ...
es not have ...
ostolic view ...
me is not a ...
d countrified ...
ing recognized ...
which it is ...
other discipline ...
now instances ...
aw point, we ...
ur inferences ...
vils of mortal ...
society and ...
a true learni ...
arguments? T ...
we loathe to ...
their names ...
The same ...
Hurd, Antich ...
terms us that ...
that the Pop ...
his wit and ...
The name of ...
seen: and of ...
Spanish writ ...
invented, th ...
wise to vent ...
The Rev. T ...
tions of the ...
who cannot ...
thus writes ...
Church was ...

culcated from them ! We are really quite melancholy at witnessing the scenes around us. It seems wholly unaccountable, how men, with the New Testament in their hands, should be deluded and bound down by so gross an imposture as Popery. But I forget myself ; the New Testament is not in their hands. The Pope first shuts that sacred book, and then imposes his own traditions. And besides, the Scriptures represent Popery as the " power of error," as " a strong delusion," as " the deceivableness of unrighteousness," as " the working of Satan with signs and lying wonders," as a judicial blindness for the neglect and abuse of light and knowledge, " because men loved not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." There is accordingly a fixed, unalterable attachment to Popery in the minds of the people, a kind of devoted, unsuspecting allegiance, " a bowing down of the soul," that their spiritual tyrants " may go over."

... But I must say, that Popery, as a whole, disgusts me more now I see it in act, than when I had merely read of it. Undoubtedly, its worst and most prominent feature is the idolatry of the Virgin Mary ; an immediate consequence of this is, the indirect or open denial of all the chief doctrines of the Gospel ; the corruption of the rule of Christian morals * follows

* As to the denial of Christian *doctrine*, hear the language of Luther : " In confession, the Papists make no mention of faith, or the merits of Christ, but only enjoin human satisfaction and merits ; as may be seen in the following form of absolution, which the monks use, and those the most devout amongst them, and which I willingly copy out, that posterity may understand the infinite and ineffable abominations of Popery.

" ' May God spare thee, brother,

" ' The merit of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the blessed Mary, always a virgin, and of all the saints, the merit of your order, the weight of your religious duties, the humility of

almost of course; and the effect of all this is, the tacit but certain encouragement which is given to scepticism and infidelity. I leave out a hundred other topics—indulgences—transubstantiation—infallibility—traditions—persecution—exclusion from salvation of all not within its pale, &c. Thank God for the Reformation!

. . . . The New Testament contains nothing of the peculiar dogmas of popery. Those who read that sacred book learn a totally different doctrine. The circulation of the Bible seems to me the most inoffensive, and yet efficacious, means of sapping superstition and idolatry now, as it was in the sixteenth century.

. . . . Never was any point of history more clearly made out than the necessity of the Reformation. Christianity was almost forgotten, both in its doctrines and duties; and a frightful code of superstition, united with manners the most corrupt, was rapidly obliterating every trace of its genuine character. Even as the Roman Catholic religion exists now, a reformation would have been indispensable. But we are to judge of the importance of that great event, not by what popery actually is, after the tacit influence on it of three centuries of evangelical truth, in the reformed churches; but by what it was before Martin Luther separated from it, and by what it would have been, long before the present day, if that heroic reformer and his noble associates had not acted as they did. And we are to recollect, that besides the gross errors, both in faith and practice, which disgraced it then, and which disgrace it still, it cherishes a spirit of per-

your confession, the contrition of your heart, the good works which you have done and will do for the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, obtain for thee the remission of thy sins, the increase of merit and grace, and the reward of eternal life. Amen.' "

secution, insists on all its absurdities as matters of faith, imposes its iron yoke on the conscience, and will hear of no remonstrance, no advice, no correction. This tyrannical dominion is one characteristic of the fallen Church of Rome.

. . . . I have witnessed to-day with grief and indignation, all the superstitions of popery in their full triumph. In other towns, the neighbourhood of protestantism has been some check on the display of idolatry ; but here in Italy, where a Protestant is scarcely tolerated, except in the chapels of ambassadors, you see what things tend to ; popery has its unimpeded course ; every thing follows the guidance and authority of the prevailing taste in religion.

. . . . At half-past ten this morning we went to the cathedral, where seats were obtained for us in the gallery near the altar. We saw the whole of the proceedings at high mass—priests almost without end—incense—singing—music—processions—perpetual changes of dress—four persons with mitres, whom the people called the little bishops—a crowd of people coming in and going out, and staring around them ; but not one prayer, nor one verse of the Holy Scriptures intelligible to the people, not even if they knew Latin ; nor one word of a sermon ; in short, it was nothing more nor less than a *pagan show*.

Popery can only be overthrown by the immediate power of that God whose grace it has been so long opposing and resisting. And indeed it is remarkable, that a *sudden unexpected overthrow*—at a moment least looked for—is the representation given us of its approaching downfall in the sacred writings.

. . . . I pass on to make a second reflection on the lamentable, though opposite evils of superstition and indifference which met us every where on our tour.

It quite astonished me, in passing through the Netherlands, to witness, for the first time, the multiplied and unscriptural pomp and idolatry of the Church of Rome. The surprise was lessened, but not the grief and shame, as I prosecuted my tour. One would think it incredible, that men professing to believe in the New Testament, should venture to impose such burdens, or that the people should submit to them. The various and open invasions which popery has made in all ages on the liberties and peace of mankind, are recorded in every history.

. . . . It is very observable, that where popery is now reviving in its influence, after the French revolutionary struggles, or the iron laws of Buonaparte, it returns with all its folly about it. It is not learning a lesson of wisdom, and silently following its Borromeos, and Pascals, and Fénétons, and dropping some of its grosser corruptions; but it re-assumes all its arts, its impositions, its ceremonies, its incense, its processions, its pilgrimages, its image worship, its exclusive claims, its domination over the conscience, its traditions, its opposition to the Bible, its hatred of scriptural education, its resistance to all the first principles and blessings of genuine liberty: in short, its united tyranny, superstition, and idolatry, and this in the full face of day and in the nineteenth century, and with infidelity watching for objections to Christianity generally.*

* The pope has lately issued two bulls, one to denounce and proscribe the *Bible*—the other to appoint the present year to be observed as a *Jubilee*, and promising remission of sins to such as should, in the course of it, make a pilgrimage to Rome.

‘These two documents should be circulated throughout the whole Christian world. From beginning to end they demonstrate that popery is, at this moment, as utterly opposed as it ever was to all freedom of conscience and intelligent use of the Scriptures: and that all hope of its having been, as a system, improved or

And what is the general moral effect of this system? It neither sanctifies nor saves. The poison of vice, glossed over with outward forms of decency, eats as doth a canker. The whole attention of man is directed to superstitious ceremonies, as a substitute for spiritual obedience. Morality is compromised and exchanged for an adherence to ecclesiastical rites. Voluptuousness, impurity, dishonesty, cunning, hypocrisy, every vice, prevails and is connived at, just as popery has the more complete sway. The dreadful profanation of the Sabbath, by prescription becomes fixed. All the holy ends of it are forgotten, unknown, obliterated.—*Wilson's Tour on the Continent.*

(185.)—Popery he (Mr. Wilberforce) was convinced was the true bane of Ireland, and he deemed it nothing less than infatuation to take any steps for its encouragement.

. . . It is irreligion and immorality of which Ireland is sick. These popery has increased and fomented.—*Life of W. Wilberforce, Esq. Vol. iii. p. 300—363.*

(186.)—. . . If therefore the Church of Rome did thrust the Protestants from her communion, for doing nothing but what became them as members of the catholic church, then that must be the schismatical

meliorated, by the course of events and the advancement of knowledge is at an end. It is fit that scriptural Christians all over the world should settle it in their minds, that popery, as a system, never has departed, and seems never likely to depart, from that which is its predicted characteristic—*blasphemous usurpation of the place of God!*—*Missionary Register, January, 1825.*

party, and not the Protestants. For, supposing any church (though pretending to be never so catholic) doth restrain her communion within such narrow and unjust bounds, that she declares such excommunicate, who do not approve all such errors in doctrine, and corruptions in practice, which the communion of such a church may be liable to, the cause of that division which follows, falls upon that church which exacts these conditions from the members of her communion : that is, when the errors and corruptions are such as are dangerous to salvation. For in this case, that church hath first divided herself from the catholic church ; for, the communion of that lying, open, and free to all, upon the necessary conditions of Christian communion, whatever church takes upon her to limit and enclose the bounds of the catholic, becomes thereby divided from the communion of the catholic church : and all such who disown such an unjust enclosure, do not so much divide from the communion of that church so enclosing, as return to the communion of the primitive and universal church. The catholic church therefore lies open and free, like a common field to all inhabitants ; now, if any particular number of these inhabitants should agree together, to enclose part of it, without consent of the rest, and not to admit any others to their right of common, without consenting to it, which of these two parties, those who deny to yield their consent, or such who deny their rights, if they will not, are guilty of the violation of the public and common rights of the place ? Now, this is plainly the case between the Church of Rome and ours ; the communion of the catholic church lies open to all such who own the fundamentals of Christian faith, and are willing to join in the profession of them ; now to these your church adds many particular doctrines,

which have no foundation in Scripture, or the consent of the primitive church—these, and many superstitious practices, are enjoined by her as conditions of her communion, so that all those are debarr'd any right of communion with her, who will not approve of them; by which it appears your church is guilty of the first violation of the union of the catholic; and whatever number of men are deprived of your communion, for not consenting to your usurpations, do not divide themselves from you any farther than you have first separated yourselves from the catholic church. And when your church by this act is already separated from the communion of the catholic church, the disowning of those things wherein your church is become schismatical, cannot certainly be any culpable separation. For, whatever is so, must be from a church so far as it is catholic; but in our case it is from a church so far only as it is not catholic, i. e. so far as it hath divided herself from the belief and communion of the universal church.

For which we must farther consider, that although nothing separates a church properly from the catholic, but what is contrary to the being of it; yet a church may separate herself from the communion of the catholic, by taking upon her to make such things the necessary conditions of her communion, which never were the conditions of communion with the catholic church. As for instance, though we should grant, adoration of the eucharist, invocation of saints, and veneration of images, to be only superstitious practices taken up without sufficient grounds in the church; yet since it appears that the communion of the catholic church was free for many hundred years, without approving or using these things; that church which shall not only publicly use, but enjoin, such things upon

pain of excommunication from the church, doth, as much as in her lies, draw the bounds of catholic communion within herself, and so divides herself from the true catholic church. For whatever confines must likewise divide the church; for by that confinement a separation is made between the part confined, and the other, which separation must be made by the party so limiting Christian communion. As it was the case of the Donatists, who were therefore justly charged with schism, because they confined the catholic church within their own bounds; and if any other church doth the same which they did, it must be liable to the same charge which they were. The sum of this discourse is, that the being of *the catholic church lies in essentials*;* that for a particular church to disagree from all other particular churches in some extrinsical and accidental things, is not to separate from the catholic church so as to cease to be a church; but still whatever church makes such extrinsical things the necessary conditions of communion, so as to cast men out of the church who yield not to them, is schismatical in so doing; for it thereby divides itself from the catholic church; and the separation from it is so far from being schism, that being cast out of the church on these terms only returns them to the communion of the catholic church. On which grounds it will appear that yours is the schismatical church, and not ours.

* If the *being* of the catholic church lies in essentials, it is evident that the Church of Rome is destitute of that *being*. Bishops Burgess, Mant, Marsh, and others, have shown this by satisfactorily proving that the churches of England and Rome differ from each other on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. To assert that the Church of Rome holds the essentials of Christianity, is virtually to deny that the exclusive Mediatorship of Christ, and justification by faith only, are essential doctrines of the Christian religion. See No. 128 to 130—[EDITOR.]

For although, before this imposing humour came into particular churches, schism was defined by the fathers, and others, to be a voluntary departure out of the church, yet that cannot in reason be understood of any particular, but the true catholic church; for not only persons but churches may depart from the catholic church; and in such cases, not those who depart from the communion of such churches, but those churches which departed from the catholic, are guilty of the schism.—*Bishop Stillingfleet. Quoted in Page's Edition of Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 100.*

(187.)— . . . In conclusion I shall only add that the key of this controversy (the Romish controversy) has ever appeared to me to be the exhibition of the superiority of Protestantism over Romanism in two leading and fundamental points.

1st. That it displays more fully the glory of God. 2dly. That it confers greater consolation and privileges on the believer. This is apparent in every part of the controversy. In the question respecting images, it is an insult to Immanuel to represent him by a senseless statue, it is degrading to man to pray before wood and stone, with the idea of raising his thoughts to heaven. The pretended infallibility of the Church of Rome places the word of God in subserviency to the word of the church, and either deprives the laity of the Scriptures, or debars them the privilege of private judgment upon their contents. The invocation of the Virgin and the saints interferes with the sole mediatorship of Christ, and diverts the supplications of the sinner from the Creator to the creature. The doctrine of merit is opposed to the all-sufficiency of the righteousness of Christ; the doctrine of the mass is hostile to

the all-sufficiency of his one great atonement ; the former teaches man to trust in the works of the creature for the expiation of his sins, the latter conducts him to purgatory. Indulgences, which are a traffic of the merits of Christ are an insult to God, and a fraud upon man. Purgatory denies that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin ; and whilst it unduly encourages the reprobate, it robs the dying saint of his peace. Transubstantiation is degrading to Christ, and it persuades those who hold it, to reject the evidence of their senses and to worship a wafer. The pretended vicegerency of the pope is treason against Christ ; how fatal his government has been to the interests of man, it is unnecessary for me to prove.

All these tenets, which are thus offensive to God and injurious to man, tend to the enriching, aggrandizement, or celebrity of *the priests*. A multiplication of objects of worship and of altars leads to a multiplication of gifts. Every religious Romanist offers at the shrine of Christ, the shrine of the Virgin, and the shrine of his patron saint ; there are offerings presented to the patron saints of every profession and every disease. The pope, also, by his prerogative of canonization, sets up as objects of special veneration and worship his most devoted servants, St. Dominick, St. Francis, St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas, &c. ; and hence their precepts and writings, in which they extol him as the God of Pharoah, &c. are read or listened to with the deepest respect. The use of images, leads to miraculous images, which serve the double purpose of keeping up an excitement by pretended prodigies, and collecting vast sums from the credulous. I need not dwell upon the mode in which indulgencies, purgatory, transubstantiation, (in which through the doctrine of intention, the priests are deemed to work a greater

miracle, than any of those wrought by Moses), the mass, infallibility, supremacy, penance, auricular confession, tend to the profit of the priesthood ; nor how the two latter are calculated to incur the anger of God, and to injure and degrade man.—*Mr. Finch's Sketch of the Romish Controversy*, p. 424.

(188.)—The sacrifice of the mass, is the most considerable part of worship in the Roman Church. It is their *juge sacrificium*, their daily and continual offering, and the principal thing in which their religion does consist. It is, they tell us, of the greatest profit and advantage to all persons, and I am sure their priests make it so to themselves ; for by this alone, a great number of them get their livings, by making merchandise of the holy sacrament, and by selling the blood of Christ at a dearer rate than Judas did. The saying of masses keeps the Church of Rome more priests in pay, than any prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers ; and it has raised more money by them, than the richest bank or exchequer in the world was ever owner of. It is indeed the truest patrimony of their church, and has enriched it more than any thing else. It was that which founded their greatest monasteries, and their richest abbeys ; and it had well nigh brought all the estates in this kingdom into the church, had not the statute of Mortmain put a check to it. The donation of Constantine, were it ever so true, and the grants of Charles and Pepin, were they ever so large, and the gifts of all their benefactors put together, are infinitely outdone by it. The gain of it has been so manifestly great, that one cannot, but on that account, a little suspect its godliness.—*Discourse*

of the Sacrifice of the Mass, by Dr. Payne, Prebendary of Westminster.

(189.)—Who can be ignorant of the deep working of the popish system? Who, that is acquainted with the history of past ages, does not mark the fearful influence which the priesthood has exercised over the deluded votaries of an idolatrous faith. Even in our own land popery is certainly raising its front. Whether its adherents are increasing or no, unquestionably it now lurks not in secret places, but erects its mass-houses, and performs its ceremonies, in the light of day. Are Protestants sufficiently alive to this? it is to be feared they are not. The popery of the present day, it is contended, is not the popery of the dark ages; we are a people too enlightened ever to embrace its dogmas, to join its mummeries, or bow our necks to its yoke. Yet is it not now looked on with a complacency unknown a century ago? Are not its abettors flattered, and caressed, and aided by many of the descendants of those who dissented from the Church of England because they thought they could discover in her ceremonies some vestige of Rome, as well as by those who are of no religious persuasion whatever? What may be the result of this, is known to God alone; our help must be in his blessed name. Let every true Protestant, however, have this for his watchword,—“No compromise with Rome.” May the pure doctrines of the Reformation be more fully known, and more distinctly promulgated among us. In their defence many a martyr shed his blood; and in their defence be it our resolution “earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints;” the faith which can alone guide in life, support in death,

and open to the believer the brightness of that land which Emanuel purchased with his blood, and which he is exalted to bestow on all who seek salvation through the merits of his cross.—*Church of England Magazine*, Vol. IV. p. 283.

(190.)—... Blind must he be who sees not that, even at the present day, danger is to be apprehended from the machinations of this wily order (the Jesuits). He must be ignorant who knows not that, even in our favourite land, they have been suffered to gain a settlement, to erect seminaries for the instruction of youth, and to exercise a most dangerous influence. They have now come boldly forward, and openly joined public processions in the character of their offices; and emissaries are secretly employed by them to entrap the unwary, to circulate books against the doctrines of the Reformation, and bring men under their bondage. Let it never be forgotten that the maxim of their great Indian apostle Francis Xavier was, “that missionaries without muskets never make converts to any purpose;” and that it is just possible this maxim may be yet carried into operation in the attempt to subvert the Protestantism of Britain.—*Ibid.* p. 336.

(191.)—... We cannot but think that the spirit of popery is in a degree to be discovered in what may be called the high church party of every establishment, though we grudge men a title which seems to imply a stronger attachment to the church than we glory in professing. Popery is the offspring, not of young

dissent, but of old establishments, not of a poor, but a rich, not of an illiterate but a fastidious, not of a zealous but a worldly body. It was the ambitious scheme of a secular priesthood to grasp the sceptre of the world. Its doctrines, its gorgeous rites, its penances and miracles, were all a sort of machinery by which men were either to be drawn or forced into the power of the priests. The Visible Church was the great image to be worshipped ; the form was to be considered as of a paramount and almost exclusive importance. The Bible was to be locked up ; the people to be kept in profound ignorance ; for all these could readily be shaped into a ladder of steps, by which the pope could mount to the throne of Christendom.—*British Review for 1812*, p. 108.

(192.)— . . . It (the Romish system) was the natural offspring of man's frail and corrupt character, and it needed no sedulous culture. No one, accordingly can point out any precise period at which this 'mystery of iniquity,' the system of Romish corruptions first began, or specify any person who introduced it. No one, in fact, ever did introduce any such system. The corruptions crept in one by one, originating for the most part, with an ignorant and depraved people, but connived at, cherished, consecrated, and successively established by a debased and worldly-minded ministry, and modified by them just so far as might best favour the views of their profligate ambition. . . . The corruptions of the Romish Church were the natural offspring of human passions, not checked and regulated by those who ought to have been ministers of the Gospel, but who, on the contrary, were ever ready to indulge and encourage men's weakness and wickedness, pro-

vided they could turn it to their own advantage.—*The Errors of Romanism, by Dr. Whately, p. 11.*

(193.)—Col. ii. 16.—“ Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom.”

The persons to whom this advice is given by the Apostle: all the saints at Colosse, the whole body of the people, are enjoined an holy familiarity with the Bible; it is to be in their houses, in their hands, and in their hearts, that it may dwell richly in them. Why then, and with what face, dare the Church of Rome forbid the common people to read the Bible, calling it an heretical book? For a reason they very well know, namely because it is the most dangerous book against Popery that ever was written in the world.—*Burkitt on the New Testament in loco.*

(194.)—If there were no other proof of the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, than the hatred of the devil, of the pope and his swarm to them, this would be sufficient evidence.—*Luther.*

(195.)—... Would the Bible be read in Ireland? Had it not been denounced in its use as a school-book as “ contrary to all that was holy and exalted ” in the Church of Rome? It had been so denounced and he verily believed a greater truth never was uttered.—*Dr. Cooke.*

(196.)—The Bible is regarded by Papists, not with reverence as the word of God, but held in abhorrence

as the most pernicious book in the world. . . . It is, in short, the very thing that such a corrupt and impure body as the Church of Rome would wish to keep out of view, because it testified against her impurities; and the fact of her having concealed it until its publication was extorted from her, is an evidence that there is a divinity in it with which her carnality did not choose to come into visible contact.—*The Protestant*, Vol. III. pp. 226, 239.

(197.)— . . . The spirit of the ancient roman paganism consisted in ceremonial pomp, founded on fables, and constructed with a view to attract the people, in the worship of dead men, whom it deified;—in the worship of Images, which it honoured with prayer, hymns, and incense,—and in persecution of the Christian church. Popery was its heir in all those things in the face of the Christian world. It differed from the elder paganism in worshipping by the name of a saint, the statue which its predecessor worshipped by the name of a goddess, and kissing the feet of St. Peter, for those of Jove.

But roman paganism with all its arts was simplicity itself to the new master of its throne. It was a thing of external glitter, and there its powers and ambition closed; it solicited no hold upon the mind; it had none of those keener and fiercer instruments of grasp and possession, the fangs and claws, that were yet to strike into the very marrow of mankind. It was a luxurious and giddy, a splendid, and sometimes a profligate exhibition, laughed at by the higher minds, amusing to the multitude, popular and pleasant to all; the graver game of the idle and self-indulgent nations of the south; a more serious shape of human pleasure,

gratifying the worshipper by some empty sense of duty done without restraint upon his passions, and keeping his vanity awake without disturbing the slumber of his conscience. It went down to the grave for a time, with its idle generation. But, when it returned to the world, a great revolution had passed over the surface. It found the old system of society broken into ruin irreparable, a host of new nations with new and rival interests, a bolder temperament, and a manlier intellectual capability, struggling for mastery, sword in hand, on the soil which had once lain smooth and uniform as the slavery that moved over it. It found a still sterner trial in the presence of the true religion, that stood, even in that day of adversity, like its Lord in the wilderness, the sign to the evil spirit that his time was at hand ; and putting his proudest temptation to shame.

To fight its battle through this iron multitude up to empire, other means were essential than the feeble contrivances of the past. A kingdom and a priesthood, it must seek conquests and converts, and it must obtain the one without an army, and the other without the Gospel. Auricular confession, absolution, indulgences, miracles of bones, images, and pictures, and, to crown the whole stupendous imposture, Transubstantiation—the claim of man to be the maker of God ! were the guilty and powerful means by which paganism, new risen, forced its way through the tumult of nations,—the spells by which weakness was made stronger than strength ; which turned the Lombard and the Norman, that had cloven down the Roman empire, into the nerveless slaves of Rome ; and bowed in worship the bold barbarian crowns and helmets of the north and west before the feet of a monk and an Italian.

One of the prophetic characters of Popery was its

“ blasphemy ; ” the enormous crime of insulting the majesty of God by abusing his name, and usurping his attributes. What are the claims of the right to forgive sins, of miracles, of canonization, of infallibility in either Pope or Council, of a right to be the sole interpreter of Scripture, to withhold the Scripture, to hold the keys of purgatory, to commute the virtues of the living for the crimes of the dead, to dissolve oaths, to dethrone kings, to break allegiance, to command that men shall be tortured and slain for their faith ?—**BLASPHEMY !**—*Rev. G. Croly on the Apocalypse*, p. 231.

(198.)— . . . The slaughters committed by the Inquisition are now beyond any accurate calculation, but they stand a fearful rivalry with the most prodigal expenditure of blood by war. The tribunal went on its course of plunder, imprisonment, torture, and burning, for six hundred years ! During the last century, the common feeling of mankind had so far penetrated even within the walls of the Inquisition, that the chief cruelties were kept from the public eye. Yet a Nun was burnt alive by the Spanish Inquisition so late as the year 1781. But what calculation of the slain can give us the true estimate of the evil, the myriads of broken hearts of orphans, widows, parents deprived of their children, families banished and beggared ; the life of perpetual fear in the presence of a tribunal against which no man at any hour was secure ; in whose hands torture, death, or an imprisonment of a length and severity, that made after life useless, and from which no man came, but as hardly escaped from the grave ? And what are we to think of the *Religion* that could create, sanction, and triumph

in this tribunal? What of the abject and desperate prostration of mind which that religion must labour to produce, before it could venture to lay the weight of the Inquisition on the world? What of the hideous repulsion of all the principles of Christianity in the establishment of this formal and cold-blooded system of murder? We may presumptuously doubt, if we will, the Scripture that declares the existence and hostility of the Evil Spirit; but on what other conception can human reason account for the horrors of the Inquisition? we are driven back to the revealed Word, and forced to see, in this triumph of torture and death, a cruelty beyond man, the form of the Fiend enveloped and enthroned in the circle of agony and flame.—*Ibid.* p. 245.

(199.)—... Ask a man who is ignorant of the Gospel of Christ, if he thinks Roman Catholics can be in a state of salvation?—he will tell you, “certainly, if they be honest, well-behaved, moral men, he thinks it most uncharitable to suppose they are not”—is it reasonable to expect, that such a man will make any efforts to reform errors, of the evil and extent of which, he is in a state of utter ignorance? But ask a man who knows the Gospel of Christ, if Roman Catholics, true to their principles, can be in a state of salvation? and he must answer decidedly—“it is impossible, that in that state they can be saved;” either the Gospel sanction is totally untrue, “he that believeth not shall be damned,” or except a man who trusts in the refuges of Popery repents, he must perish.

... CAN ROMAN CATHOLICS REST THE HOPE OF THEIR IMMORTAL SOULS ON THOSE REFUGES WHICH

THEIR CHURCH SETS BEFORE THEM, AND BE IN A STATE OF SALVATION ? I answer plainly, simply, broadly, directly, in the face of all the charges of folly and fanaticism, and bigotry and uncharitableness, with which ignorance or *liberality*, whether it be that which verges to Popery, or that which verges to infidelity, may assail the assertion—THAT IT IS UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE, THAT A ROMAN CATHOLIC CAN BE SAVED WHO REALLY DEPENDS ON THE LYING REFUGES WHICH HIS CHURCH SETS BEFORE HIM.

I add, moreover, that all the talents and learning in the empire are utterly incompetent to overthrow the assertion, for this simple reason—It is truth. *The truth of the Christian religion infers the truth of this proposition, and they must stand or fall together. . .*

There is not a man, I care not who he be—more cordially, devotedly attached to the genuine, faithful, scriptural principles and constitution of the Established Church ; but in proportion to that attachment to that government and that religion, will I lift my feeble voice against the conduct that disgraces them both : and if it were my last dying testimony, and that I were called to bear it in the face of all the British senate—if I were called to utter it in the presence of all the bishops of the Church of England, I would say, that no man, who remembers that “ *The Lord reigneth,*” can be surprised, that a Protestant government, which can so far forget the primary duties of the Christian religion as to maintain a College for the education of the Popish priesthood, should be made to shake and reel to its foundation, with the political convulsions of Popish agitation ; or that a succession of Bishops, who can tamely permit such an insult to the religion of that God, who has set them up as watchmen in the land, who can permit the edu-

cation of men to teach this superstition to their country, and live and die without an effort to dispel it, should have their Church overwhelmed and their religion trampled in the dust, by the persecuting spirit of Popish superstition. I venerate the office—I respect the talents—I admire the learning—and I do not presume individually to judge the motives of those who fill that sacred office at this day. I write not against persons but principles. . .—*Truth and Error Contrasted* by Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, p. 322, 335.

(200.)—I know well that Romanists affect to laugh at the enthusiastic absurdity of calling popery Babylon, and threatening her with Babylon's plagues. It is easy, however, to laugh, either in the idiotcy of self-deception, or even while the heart bleeds under the lash of conscience. It would be more satisfactory, more reasonable, more in accordance with their professed love of free discussion in these days, to give their attention to the Apocalypse, and defend themselves against the historical illustrations, the close reasonings, and the legitimate conclusions of Mr. Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and others, who have declared to the world, that the Babylon of the visions of the beloved disciple, the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, the great harlot with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, for twelve hundred and sixty years, is Popery. The very existence of such a controversy, so maintained, should drive them to the Scriptures if they love the light. It is too late for them now to screen themselves in the affected dignity of silence, behind the folds of the mantle of infallibility. That covering

may suffocate those who wear it, but it can no longer deceive the world.

. . . The Holy Ghost saith, *every word of God is good*. Reason and conscience respond, it is, it must be so. But popery says, No : the Bible is useless to some, and dangerous to others ; and it must not be circulated without human helps and human guards. How could this opposition have originated ? Mr. Faber shrewdly remarks, that “ if the Bible be against any set of men, those men are very apt to be against the Bible.” If the Bible, then, be plainly against Romanism, we can understand why the Romanists should object to its free circulation, untrammelled by their church authority, or unscriptural annotations.

. . . Now, mark, my Brethren, how Romanism seeks to undermine this sure foundation. (The all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ.) The Creed of Pius IV. declares, that “ in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead.” And the Council of Trent has decreed, that “ if any one say that in the mass there is not a true and proper sacrifice offered unto God ; or that to be offered, is nothing else but for Christ to be given to us to eat, let him be anathema.” Is then the sacrifice of Christ once offered not sufficient ? And must a propitiatory sacrifice be repeated in the mass ; the performance of which mass is at the discretion of the Priest, or Bishop, or Pope ? And is the expiation of this needed for the dead also ? Then farewell peace with God, farewell love, farewell the cheerful willing obedience of the child, crying Abba, Father. Either the conscience of the Romanists must remain callous to the touch of sin ; or its wounds must be palliated, not healed, by the quackeries of superstition ; or the awakened sinner must be driven to des-

pair. Is it wonderful then, that Popery, the very life of which centres in these continued sacrifices of the mass, should resist, and when she dares, prohibit the circulation of the Bible, which proclaims, so that he who runs may read it, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, that there is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, and that they shall not come into condemnation, but are passed from death unto life?—*Rev. Hugh M'Neile's Sermon on Papal Restrictions on the Reading of the Holy Scriptures, 1828.*

(201.)— . . . What is it, in the just and spiritual view of the question, which ought to make any religion worthy to be set up by a Christian government as the established religion of a nation? Is it not that her doctrines, her principles, her confessions, should be purely scriptural and holy—her forms of worship, her government, her discipline, modelled, as far as human wisdom can effect, according to the word and will of her Creator? When it is asked, is this the case of the Established religion of this country? we answer—we believe it to be more so, than of any that ever has appeared as a national religion on the face of the earth. If then this is the case—if the laws demand that it should be supported and maintained by the nation, and that, for the national benefit, for the national happiness, for the temporal and eternal welfare of men, and for the glory of God—is it fit that the vast majority of those, at least in this part of the empire, who profess a system of superstition the most awful in the world, should be left by us in blind and total ignorance of any blessings, any advantages, that the na-

tional religion which they are called on by the laws to support, possesses over that superstition in which they are educated by their priests? They tell the poor deluded people, that the religion of the Established Church is heresy and falsehood. What efforts have been made to disabuse the minds of that people, and to prove to them the heresy and falsehood of their own? What is the plain and simple state of the case? After various national miseries, disasters, convulsions, and revolutions; a religion has been given to us, through the great and infinite mercy of God, as the established religion of this land, which derives its very name from solemnly protesting against the awful apostacy and superstition of the Church of Rome—a religion, which secures to us the possession of all that is to be valued by us as men, as freemen, and as Christians. To give to it stability, it is founded on the holy Word of the Eternal God—to afford it security, it is incorporated with the laws and constitution of the country—to invest it with authority, it is endowed with honour, and dignity, and wealth—and to give it opportunities of usefulness, the whole kingdom is parcelled out under the superintendence of its dignitaries, and under the instruction of its ministers, and each individual is made tributary to their support, that they, in return, may be instrumental to his temporal and everlasting happiness.

. . . Now, what has been the conduct of us Protestants? We have not only been accustomed to denounce the Antichristian errors of the Church of Rome in various formularies and articles of our religion—not only have all our bishops and ministers solemnly vowed to “be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s word;” but as we considered the awful

principles of Rome, not only subversive of man's everlasting happiness, but utterly incompatible with the preservation of those political, moral, and social privileges and blessings, which our own religion secured to us; we have been accustomed in the most solemn manner as a nation, by our legislators, by our lords spiritual and temporal, by all the persons who represented the people of the land, by all those whom we have been taught to consider great, and venerable, and sacred, in rank, in character, and office—before they could be individually qualified to enact one law, or perform one legislative or judicial act in our realm, we have been accustomed to denounce, in the face of all Europe, the Roman Catholic religion as idolatrous and superstitious. I do not touch on the politics of this question; I speak of it in a moral and religious point of view; and I simply ask, have all these venerable characters in the nation—has the British nation, by these, its highest, most venerable, most dignified, most sacred authorities—been thus, in the face of Europe, proclaiming a truth, or proclaiming a falsehood? They and the nation have done one or the other; and that, in all the 'pomp and circumstance' in which the first and greatest nation in the world could perform the most solemn act of qualifying its legislators for the enactment of its laws. If they have been proclaiming a falsehood in the face of Europe—if they have been falsely charging so many millions of British subjects, with the guilt of idolatry and superstition—then, what a shame, what a blot, what a brand of moral and political turpitude, has such conduct stamped upon the laws of Britain! The late repeal of those laws, instead of being wrung by a popular wrestle from the reluctant grasp of the majority of the nation, ought to have been carried by England, with her monarch at

her head, and laid with tears of repentance and contrition, at the feet of the pope of Rome. But if, on the contrary, the laws of England have enacted what was just and true—if these the highest officers and the most august authorities, the most sacred functionaries within her realm, have been proclaiming a truth—a truth, which is ratified by every formulary of her church—a truth, which is established by the holy word of her Creator—when they have denounced the millions of her subjects as idolatrous and superstitious; then, when we ask, what has England done for these victims of idolatry, what has England done for these votaries of superstition? and when the facts cry out from every corner of the land, NOTHING, when all the guilt and misery of Ireland echoes from every rock around her shore the answer, NOTHING; then, I say, if the falsehood of such a denunciation were a blot upon her laws, the truth of it stamps a ten-fold blot on her religion: not, indeed, on the principles of our church, for they are pure, and just, and holy; but on the degeneracy of those who call themselves by her name. We have solemnly proclaimed them idolaters—we have done more: we have visited on them the penalties of their idolatry; but we have done nothing to reform them from that idolatry. We have been peremptory in the infliction of the penalty, but we have been utterly regardless of the consequences attendant on the crime—we have been clamorous in calling for the continuation of the penalty, because we felt that its removal would endanger our own temporal interests, but we have tacitly acquiesced in the continuance, the prevalence, the increase, the accumulation of that guilt, which has been fatal alike to the everlasting interests of our fellow-creatures; and derogatory, nay, insulting to the honour, the majesty, the glory of our God.—

Truth and Error Contrasted, by Rev. R. J. M'Ghee,
p. 163—167.

(202.)—... Faith repentance and holiness are the essential constituents of scriptural religion, but according to the principles of the Church of Rome—these 'weighty matters' are nothing and vanity, unless a man belong to their communion. To prove his claim to the blessings of the Christian covenant, he must be previously assured of the sacramental validity of his baptism which is made to depend on the canonical and apostolical succession of the priesthood. He must be within the pale of their church, or all his virtues and graces and hopes are nothing. I do not say that every individual member of their church would assert this, but this is unquestionably the doctrine of their creeds and councils. Whatever might be the proofs of a man's personal Christianity by a life of the most exemplary conformity to the will of Christ, and an exclusive reliance for salvation on the merits of Christ, all would be of no avail, unless he were in actual fellowship with them.

That system of opinions which thus provides for the intolerance of its adherents, and leads them to overlook the essential distinctions of Christian character, necessarily magnifies the importance of ritual observances. The consequence is obvious—an undue anxiety is felt about what is visible and external; and religion degenerates into a round of ceremonies. To this result the worship and service of the Roman Church are directly subservient, and the notions entertained respecting the efficacy of sacraments are in awful contradiction to the most solemn assurances of Scripture. If baptism

regenerates, and confirmation sanctifies, and penance absolves, and the eucharist communicates the actual body and blood of Christ,—and extreme unction gives them a passport to heaven, and all these wonders are effected by the mystic power of the sacraments, validly administered, what must be the *general* and the *prevailing* state of sentiment and feeling in the Church of Rome on the subject of personal religion? will there not be a natural alienation of the mind from every thing rational and spiritual, and a fatal complacency and satisfaction in the bodily service; the outward and visible signs of an instituted ritual?—*Rev. Joseph Fletcher's Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion.*

(203.)—The doctrine so justly denounced in this Article (the 14th) as arrogant and impious is one of the pestilent and abominable delusions of the Church of Rome, whereby she has ruined many precious immortal souls. The Church of Rome maintains, that man is able, not only to do enough to justify himself, but to do *even more than enough*; and that many holy men and women, especially the saints of the Popish Calendar, have done *so much more* than was required to purchase *their own* salvation, that the *overplus of merit* is laid up in a sort of common stock, from whence the pope and his priests have the power of dispensing, according to their discretion, to such as need to have any deficiencies supplied. Upon this ground the Church of Rome has raised large sums of money, and carried on a very lucrative trade in the sale of what are called *indulgences*, i. e. free pardons granted by the pope for any sin or sins, upon the

payment of a certain sum of money ; which pardon or indulgence makes over to the person *a portion of the superfluous merits of the saints*, exempts him from eternal punishment, and gains him a title to heaven !

It can hardly be needful to say a word in refutation of a doctrine so absurd and monstrous . . . The subject, however, will furnish a few general remarks by way of application, on which I pray God to grant His blessing. In the first place, we may observe, that there is **ONE WORK**, and *only ONE*, which may justly be called *a work of supererogation* ; and that is *the work of the Lord Jesus Christ*, in doing and suffering what He did as the Saviour of sinners. *There was a work infinitely beyond anything that could have been required or expected ! There was a work infinitely meritorious !* A work, too, whose merit was not at all needed by Him who performed it, but the merit of which may be made over to every poor, bankrupt, condemned sinner, that renounces all merit of his own, and looks humbly, simply, and entirely to Jesus Christ for salvation. Here, indeed, is a store-house, of which no pope or priest keeps the key,—a store-house open to all,—a store-house from whence, without money and without price, you may purchase pardon to cover all your sins, and a righteousness that shall make good your title to heaven. O brethren, trust in no other works but *Christ's blessed work of supererogation !*

In the *next* place, I would say,—Whenever any of the false doctrines of the Church of Rome are brought before us, how ought our hearts to overflow with gratitude to Almighty God, at thus beholding from what poisonous and damnable errors He, of his infinite mercy, has delivered our highly-favoured church and nation ! We are but little aware of our greatest bless-

ings ; too prone to enjoy them without appreciating their value, or remembering the gracious and bountiful hand that bestows them. Let us look back to the days of our forefathers, and compare *our* present privileges with *their* privations. There *was* a time, when Britain was not even numbered among the nations,—when she was spoken of as the mere extremity of the world, ‘ Britons, quite cut off from all the globe.’ Her sons were *then* naked painted savages, bowing down to idols of wood and stone. And even after God had been pleased, of his great mercy, to send the light of His Gospel to our benighted shore, how soon did the craft of the devil and the wickedness of man corrupt and obscure that blessed light ! how soon did the Beast of Rome rear her horrid head among us, and reduce us to a state very little better than heathenism ! By her accursed sorceries our unhappy ancestors were taken off from the worship of the true God, to pray to saints and angels, and to bow down again to *images*. It is true, that among those images the figure of the Saviour on the cross bore the principal place,—but He was no longer pointed out as the *only* Mediator, and men were taught to trust more in the Virgin Mary and the saints than in Christ ; yea, to trust most of all to their own superstitious performances, as the sure price of eternal salvation. Public worship was turned into a mere round of ceremonious mummeries, processions, and pageants ; the gospel was no longer preached, the Scriptures no longer read to the people ; and the whole services of the Church were conducted in the Latin tongue, which few could understand, and which frequently was unknown even to the ignorant priest who mumbled it over. The blessed Bible was entirely locked up *from the people*, because the priests knew, that, if read, it would expose their imposture, and put an end

to their power and wealth. *To possess and to read any part of the Scriptures*, was the greatest offence that a layman could then commit. But time would fail were we to attempt a complete picture of the wretchedness and degradation of our beloved country during the dark ages of popery. Thanks be to God ! “ the darkness is past,” and the “ true light now shineth,” (1 John ii. 8.) The blessed change, however, was not effected without a severe and lengthened struggle. It is now five hundred years ago since the struggle commenced. God, *then*, of His mercy, raised up the illustrious WICKLIFFE, well called *the morning star of the Reformation*, who translated the Scriptures into English, protested against the abominations of popery, and preached the true Gospel of Christ. He himself escaped the rage of the enemy ; not so his followers, who were exposed to the most cruel persecutions ; so that for two succeeding centuries there were but few who dared openly to profess the truth of Jesus. After that period, however, it pleased God to lay bare his arm in a wonderful manner for our deliverance. *The quarrels of the wicked among themselves* led to the accomplishment of God’s righteous and merciful purposes. A haughty and abandoned monarch, ‘ who neither feared God nor regarded man,’ cast off his allegiance to the pope, and pronounced this long-enslaved nation *free from the yoke of Rome*. The men of God *then* took courage : the Bible was brought forth from its hiding-place, the delusions of popery were exposed, and the truth was once more preached to the people. Not that the contest was even then completed : many precious servants of God were yet called to seal their testimony with their blood. Again, for a season, the kingdom fell under the sceptre of a popish queen, and *the fires*

of persecution were lighted up all over the country, and Christians, of every rank, age, and sex, were dragged victims to the stake. But the prayers of those dying saints were heard : ‘ God of His mercy,’ did ‘ restore His Gospel to England once again :’ the blood of martyrs became the seed of the church ; and the torch applied to the funeral pile of our Latimer and Ridley, ‘ lighted such a candle in England, as by God’s grace, has never been put out.’ We, my brethren, are living in the full blaze of it. We are privileged to have our lot cast in “ the days of the Son of man,” in the days of gospel-light and gospel-liberty. The Bible is now in the hands of every person. In every part of this highly-favoured realm, the life-giving sound of the Gospel may be heard. “ Blessed are the eyes which see the things which *we* see, for many prophets, and kings, and righteous men have desired to see those things that *we* see, and have not seen them ; and to hear those things which *we* hear, and have not heard them.” (Luke x. 23, 24.) O, my friends, let us never cease to bless God for his unspeakable mercy in the *glorious Reformation*.

But now in the *third* place, while we thank God for these great mercies, let us see that we are duly aware of the errors we protest against. The cry of “ No Popery,” is a cry in which *every* friend of religion, knowledge, liberty, and humanity will heartily join. But there is reason to apprehend, that some who are wont to raise or join the cry, are yet *secretly attached to Popery, in their hearts, and bitterly hostile to the genuine doctrines of Protestantism*. For, wherein does Popery *really* consist ? Not merely in acknowledging the authority of the Pope, and bowing down to a crucifix or an image, and sprinkling the body with *holy water* and attending mass, and saying Latin

prayers, und making confession to a priest, and fasting every Friday, and so forth ; *real, genuine* Popery lies much deeper than this ; it lies *in the heart*, in the very core of our fallen nature. *Popery* is the favourite religion of the corrupt heart of proud, fallen man. Every man, by nature, is *essentially* a Papist : for every man, by nature, hugs and delights in those notions which form the *very essence* of Popery. And what are those notions ? They are as follows :—that man can merit salvation by his own works, performances, good qualities, ceremonious observances, and present sufferings :—that he either has no need of the Saviour at all ; or, at the utmost, only requires Him as a sort of make-weight, to supply what may be deficient in the merit of the creature. Alas ! my friends, how many there are, *calling* themselves “ Protestants,” whose creed, if examined closely, would vary but little from what has just been stated ! Go round and ask persons, “ On what grounds they hope for salvation ? ” and in how many instances will the answer be, “ Because I have done no harm, have been regular in my life, honest in my dealings, and punctual in my religious observances ! ” In some, indeed, we should even find a leaning to the very doctrine exploded by our present Article ; (the 14th) for, if any consider their mere *negative* good qualities, or their attention to the common duties and decencies of life, as sufficient to purchase heaven,—surely, then, whatever is done beyond this (such for instance, as alms-deeds, and works of charity) must be estimated as *works of supererogation*. *The sufferings and afflictions of this life* also, if they fall heavily on such persons, are generally regarded as entitling them to a peculiar claim on God’s notice and retribution, being chastisements far beyond their deserts.—*Hancock’s*

Discourses on some of the principal Articles of the Church of England, p. 82, 91. Fourth Edition.

(204.)—... When a Christian comes to die, he is not entering upon a scene entirely new to him. From the hour of his first believing, he became dead to the world, and the things of the world. It became part of his daily exercise to realize, by familiar contemplation, his transition from this world to the next; and his every-day reflections, so far as he is enabled to live up to his new character and state, are reflections suitable to the last day and hour of his life. Committing the keeping of his soul to his Creator in well-doing, every day, he fears not that he will be left alone to fight with his enemy the devil, when he comes to his last day; and when that day does arrive, he feels not the want of any new operation or process to pass upon either his soul or his body, to prepare him for death. He stands complete in his Saviour's righteousness; and knowing in whom he has believed, he commits his soul to him in the sure and certain hope of being found with him in peace when he shall appear to judge the world in righteousness.

But the Popish doctrine represents a dying Christian in a state quite new, and as unprovided for, as if it had been unexpected. The Council of Trent speaks of the powerful protection of the sacrament of extreme unction as necessary to fortify the latter end of our life; and it is to be used only when that period is understood to have arrived. Christ appointed no means of fortifying the soul at the end of life, but such as a Christian ought to make use of every day of his life, because he requires his people to consider every day as if it were their last: but the Church

of Rome has a sacrament intended for the dying only, and which she applies for the salvation of persons, many of whom never thought of salvation before ; who were living in sin, and who hope to be saved from its punishment by the virtue of this sacrament, which, like all the rest, is sold to them for money. In this article alone, though there was nothing else against her, the Church of Rome appears in a character so diabolical, as to point her out as the very Antichrist ; the blasphemous of God, and the destroyer of the souls of men.

. . . The Church of Rome represents the last hours of her Christians as invariably, if not necessarily, a period of the most dreadful alarm, and of the most severe conflict with the devil. When his strength is gone, and when just a-dying, the papist has to encounter all the power and craft of the devil, raised to their highest degree of excitement ; he must, in short, enter the lists with Satan, as if he were his equal in strength ; and he is not taught to seek assistance from any higher power than a fellow-creature, with a phial of consecrated oil, which he believes to be sufficient to frighten the devil away from him. Every child who understands the terms must see, that the religion which teaches this is not Christianity, but a mere, and a very absurd, modification of heathenism.

. . . All that Christ did and suffered for the salvation of sinners, goes for nothing with a papist, unless his priest be allowed to have the honour of making it available. Thus, extreme unction is not a vain ceremony, or a mere absurdity which, when it has excited a sufficient degree of ridicule, may be left to the peaceable enjoyment of those who are in love with it. It is in itself a real Antichrist. It occupies the place of Christ in the ministrations of popish priests, and in

the thoughts of dying papists. Christ himself is the only ground of hope in the hour of death. He is as accessible at the last minute of the eleventh hour, as he is in the first hour; and it is the duty of every Christian who may be called to attend the dying-bed of a sinner, to tell him of Christ as the Almighty and the only Saviour, who is able to save unto the uttermost all that come to God by him; and this truth brought to his ears, *may* be so imprest upon his heart by the Holy Spirit, as to effect his conversion. I do not say it *shall* be so; for, in general men are left to die as they have lived; but I say, it *may* be so, because Christ has not instructed his servants to prescribe limits to the exercise of his mercy towards sinners in the present life. But the popish doctrine of extreme unction leaves Christ quite out of the view of a dying sinner; and the priest, and the anointing, are put in his place. Accordingly, when a papist is supposed to be dying, his great, his only concern, is to have the priest, with his holy oil; and to have this applied to all the members of his body, by means of which he may have committed sin; and to the organs of sight and hearing, by which sin may have found its way into the heart. Here Christ is not thought of at all. The priest and the oil are the saviour in which he confides. He ventures his eternity upon a deception; goes down to the grave with a lie in his right hand; and, while he perishes, the guilt of his murder lies at the door of the church that deceived and ruined him.—*The Protestant*, vol. iii. p. 253.

(205.)—... Purgatory, it must be confessed, makes no great figure in the Douay Catechism. Instead of giving it the honour of a chapter by itself, as a doc-

trine of such importance deserves, the compilers, as if afraid of exposing it to the light in this enlightened country, have thrust it into a corner of a chapter which bears the title of ' the kinds of sin expounded.'

" Q. Whither go such as die in mortal sin ? A. To hell to all eternity.—Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins ? A. To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven.—Q. What proof have you of this in the New Testament ? A. First, from our Saviour's own words. Matt. xii. 32, where, speaking of the remission of sins, he says, ' there is one that will not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come : ' which words St. Austin says, would not be true, if some sins were not forgiven in the next world ; and this implies a purgatory, for there only is remission of sin, and not in hell or in heaven. Second, from St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 15, where he speaks of some, under the guilt of sin, that shall be saved, *yet so as by fire.*"

This is all that the Douay Catechism teaches concerning purgatory ; and, I think, it will be allowed that here there are some great and fundamental errors. The first that strikes us is that which makes a distinction between mortal and venial sin. From the word of God we learn that sin, and that every sin, without exception, is the object of divine abhorrence ; and that the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* unrighteousness and all ungodliness of men, without any exception. In the whole Bible, there is no such thing as a small or venial sin mentioned or alluded to. It is declared that he who offendeth in one point is a transgressor of the whole law, because the single transgression, however trivial the matter may appear to men, indicates a state of mind in the offen-

der, which is opposed to the authority of the Law-giver; and is, therefore, opposed to every precept of the law itself. I allude at present to this subject only in general terms, it may come afterwards more formally in our way, as a distinct subject of discussion.

Another fundamental error plainly avowed by the Douay doctors in the above extract, is, that men must make full satisfaction to divine justice, even for their mortal sins, or they must go 'to hell for all eternity.' It is supposed that some persons die who have not 'fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins;' and these go 'to purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them.' I believe it is not possible in fewer words, to set aside altogether the atonement of Christ. It was declared of him that he should finish transgression, make an end of sin, make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24. When he appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh, it was to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. x. 12; and it is declared that by him we receive the atonement, or reconciliation, Rom. v. 2. He only was able to make satisfaction for the sins of his people, and he alone has done it; the sinner believing in him, receives the atonement; he sees that satisfaction has been made for his sins by the death of Christ; thus he enjoys peace with God, and the assurance of his favour; and he knows that he is no more able to make full, or even partial satisfaction for his sins, than he is to create a world.,

But the Douay Catechism teaches that every individual must make full satisfaction for his sins, either in this world, or in a certain fancied middle state which they call purgatory. According to this doctrine,

Christ has done nothing for them in the way of satisfaction or atonement, for they must do all for themselves. This, therefore, is the Antichrist, which sets aside the doctrine of Christ, and salvation through him alone. In comparison of this, their baptism of bells, and all their other mummary, are harmless, and not worthy to be named. This subverts the whole system of divine revelation, and brings Popery down to the level of the grossest heathenism. It is a religion without a Saviour ; which leaves every man to satisfy divine justice for himself ; and is, therefore, no better than that of Mahomet, or of the Grand Lama of Thibet.

The above are some of the fundamental errors of the Douay Catechism relating to Purgatory.

. . . . When Christianity became popular, and the profession of it fashionable, heathens professing to be Christians, brought into the church all their heathenish notions, and purgatory among the rest.

. . . . How can a man resign himself to death without the most fearful apprehension, if he believes there is a debt standing against him in the court of eternal justice,—a debt for which he must make satisfaction, by suffering torments in his own person, for a period, perhaps, much longer than his whole life in this world ? But this is what every Papist is taught to believe with regard to himself, unless he shall die a martyr, or perform some signal service to the church, such as it is not possible for one in a million to perform.

It is true, the dying sinner, if he be a rich man, may compound for ages of misery, by bequeathing his wealth to the church ; but the comfort which this is calculated to afford, must be greatly diminished by the reflection, that he is leaving his family in poverty :

and, what is infinitely worse, he cannot be sure that his whole property, however great, will serve the purpose of saving his soul from ages of torment. His widow and children may become beggars, and yet, for any thing that he knows, he will derive but little relief, from his having robbed them to enrich the church. His ghostly guides are miserable comforters ; for, with all their impudence, which in general is not small, they do not pretend to say *for certain*, that so much money will effectually deliver a soul from purgatory. Though it should be thousands of pounds, and as many masses as these can purchase, the utmost that can be effected by them, is only a certain degree of relief, or mitigation, or abridgment of the duration of the torments which a soul is condemned to endure, though for any thing that the sinner knows, or the priest can tell, the abridgment may be no more than one year out of a thousand.

The case which I have supposed is one of the most favourable, for it is the case of a rich man ; and it cannot be denied, that Popery is a religion which looks upon the rich with a more favourable aspect than upon the poor. Those who are rich, may buy *some* mitigation of their torments, but those who have nothing to pay, must suffer in their own persons all the torments of the purgatorian fire, until they have made full satisfaction to divine justice. It is true they may comfort themselves with the belief that their surviving friends will pay money to have masses said for them ; but when they reflect how poor their friends are, and what a monstrous debt stands against them, I am afraid, nay, I am sure, no poor sinner can derive much comfort from this reflection.

Gother, indeed, tells us, that “ such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or

procure masses for their relief, are not neglected by the church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office." This is avowedly a concession in favour of those who "have *no relations or friends* to pray for them, or give *alms*, or procure masses for their relief:" from which it is clearly to be inferred, that those who have relations and friends can expect no relief but by their means, that is by their giving alms, and procuring masses for them; which in plain English, is neither more nor less than paying money to the priests.

By this arrangement, the poor who have no friends, are left in a very awkward predicament. They are declared to be in purgatory; but the church takes no particular interest in any one of them, just because there is nobody to pay money for them. They are brought in by the lump, in "a general commemoration of *all the faithful* departed in every mass." But such a general commemoration must be of little avail, when there is no specific reference to any individual case. In this general commemoration are included, all who paid for themselves, by bequeathing money for masses, and all whose friends have paid for them, as well as those who had neither money nor friends to leave behind them; and it may easily be supposed, that the *intentions* of the priests, in saying their masses, will be directed to the souls of those for whom they have been best paid; and the poor in purgatory as well as the poor in this world, will be esteemed by mercenary priests as little worth.

It is worthy of remark, that, according to this much admired Popish author, there is in every mass, at this very day, a commemoration of *all* the faithful deceased. From the connexion of the words it ap-

pears, that this commemoration signifies prayers, alms, and masses, offered up to God for their relief; that is, of *all* the faithful that have departed out of this world, I suppose, since the days of the apostles; for surely it will not be said, that the Christians of those days were not of the faithful. Then according to this doctrine, they are all in purgatory still. The Church of Rome will not avow the inconsistency of offering up masses and prayers to God, for the relief of those who are already relieved, and happy in heaven. Then according to the Popish notion of St. Peter having the keys of heaven, it will appear, that he has most tenaciously kept the door shut; for no sinner has passed thither out of purgatory since he received the commission. Now it may fairly be asked, for what purpose the priests have been saying their masses for so many hundred years? For what have they applied the millions of money extorted from the people, under the pretext of relieving souls from purgatory, when, so far as appears, not one soul has yet been relieved? Prayers and masses are yet offered up to God daily, for the relief of *them all*!

. . . The grand point to which every thing in the system of Popery tends, is to get money, insomuch, that one is led to imagine that the Pope is no other than an incarnation of the ancient idol, Mammon, and that the priests are his tax-gatherers. . . .

. . . It is declared by all the Romish doctors who write on the subject, that without the purgatorian fire, men cannot go to heaven; yet money can purchase exemption from this fire, or mitigate its pains. What is this, but to teach that money can open the gate of heaven? or that money can procure admittance for persons who have not undergone the necessary purgation? Now, suppose for a moment, that this has

taken place. Suppose that a man who had led a most wicked life, had died without repentance ; or to use the words of my Popish author, had “ not taken care to blot out by repentance,” the guilt of any, even the least sin,—suppose, I say such a person to go to purgatory, in order to be purified, and made meet for heaven, would it not be a most cruel thing to interrupt the process of purification, and to force his passage through the fire, before it had produced its full effect upon him ? This would be in reality to force the man into heaven before he was fit for it, and to such a man it would be no heaven, but a place of punishment, equal to all that Papists have fancied of their purgatory.

I know it will be answered, that God is pleased, in consideration of a certain number of masses, for which a sum of money must be paid, to mitigate the rigour of the punishment of souls in purgatory, and remit so much of the debt that is due. But what then becomes of his justice, which is declared to be so inflexible as not to remit the punishment of the least sin without satisfaction ? It comes inevitably to this, that Papists consider God to be such a one as themselves, who will consent to any thing for money. The idea is so horribly impious, that I scarcely know how to write it ; and yet it is inseparable from the doctrine of purgatory, and the remission of its pains, in consideration of money paid to the priest for masses, which masses are declared to have so much virtue, as to procure a remission or mitigation of those pains which the justice of God had imposed on account of sin.—*The Protestant*, vol. ii. pp. 194, 229.

(206.)— . . . The pope, by departing from the doctrine and practice of St. Peter, would forfeit his title of successor to him ; for in such a case no succession in place or in name could preserve it ; “ *the popes themselves had swerved and degenerated from the example of Peter.*”

“ *They are not the sons of the saints, who hold the places of the saints, but they that do their works.*” (Which place is rased out of St. Jerome.)

“ *They have not the inheritance of Peter, who have not the faith of Peter, which they tear asunder by ungodly division.*” So Gregory Nazianzen saith of Athanasius, that *he was successor of Mark no less in piety than presidency ; the which we must suppose to be properly succession : otherwise the mufti of Constantinople is successor to St. Andrew of St. Chrysostom, &c. the mufti of Jerusalem to St. James. If then the bishop of Rome, instead of teaching Christian doctrine, doth propagate errors contrary to it ; if, instead of guiding into truth and godliness, he seduceth into falsehood and impiety ; if, instead of declaring and pressing the laws of God, he delivereth and imposeth precepts opposite, prejudicial, destructive of God’s laws ; if, instead of promoting genuine piety, he doth (in some instances) violently oppose it ; if, instead of maintaining true religion, he doth pervert and corrupt it by bold defalcations, by superstitious additions, by foul mixtures and alloys ; if he coineth new creeds, articles of faith, new scriptures, new sacraments, new rules of life, obtruding them on the consciences of Christians ; if he conformeth the doctrines of Christianity to the interests of his pomp and profit, making gain godliness ; if he prescribe vain, profane, superstitious ways of worship, — turning devotion into foppery, and pageantry ; if, instead of preserving order and peace, he fomenteth discords and*

factions in the church, being a make-bait and incendiary among Christians ; if he claimeth exorbitant power, and exerciseth oppression and tyrannical domination over his brethren, cursing and damning all that will not submit to his dictates and commands ; if, instead of being a shepherd he is a wolf, worrying and tearing the flock by cruel persecution ; he by such behaviour, *ipso facto*, depriveth himself of authority and office ; he becometh thence no guide or pastor to any Christian ; there doth in such case rest no obligation to hear or obey him ; but rather to decline him, to discost from him, to reject and disclaim him.

This is the reason of the case ; this the holy scripture doth prescribe ; this is according to the primitive doctrine, tradition, and practice of the church.*—*A Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, by Dr. Isaac Barrow. See Enchiridion Theologicum Anti-Romanum, vol. ii. p. 404.*

(207.)— . . . All Romanists, in consistence with their principles, do seem obliged to hold this opinion concerning the pope's universal power. . . . No man

* Abp. Tillotson observes that the doctrine of transubstantiation ' is like a millstone hung about the neck of popery, it will sink it at the last.' What transubstantiation is to the Church of Rome, apostolical succession by lineal descent only, may be to the Church of England, and sink it at the last, especially if the extravagant notions entertained by the Oxford Tract writers, upon this subject, should extensively prevail.

It is this monstrous dogma which leads Mr. Palmer (see p. 32) to recognise the idolatrous Church of Rome, as a true portion of the Church of Christ, and to say,—' if residing in France or Spain, the law of unity requires that we should be willing to communicate with the Romish Churches there established.' What inadequate conceptions must such a person have of the heinous character of idolatry !—EDITOR.

apprehending it false, seemeth capable with good conscience to hold communion with those who profess it : for, upon supposition of its falsehood, the pope and his chief adherents are the teachers and abettors of the highest violation of divine commands, and most enormous sins ; of usurpation, tyranny, imposture, perjury, rebellion, murder, rapine, and all the villainies complicated in the practical influence of this doctrine. It seemeth clear as the sun, that, if this doctrine be an error, it is one of the most pernicious heresies that ever was vented ; involving the highest impiety, and producing the greatest mischief. For if he that should teach adultery, incest, simony, theft, murder, or the like crimes, to be lawful, would be a heretic ; how much more would he be such that should recommend perjury, rebellion, regicide, (things inducing wars, confusions, slaughters, desolations, all sorts of injustice and mischief) as duties—*Ibid.* p. 23.

(208.)—... If they (the Romanists) could prove a visible succession of doctrine and worship, as well as bishops, from the apostles, that they believed and practised neither more nor less through all the several ages of the church to this day, than what St. Peter taught them, though this would not make them the judge of controversies, yet they would be good witnesses of the apostolical faith, and there would be great reason to inquire what their faith and worship is ; but their mere succession to the apostles does not prove that they have neither diminished nor added to the faith of the apostles ; for there is no natural necessity that those who succeed should always be of the mind of their predecessors ; and we have plain evidence, that the Church of Rome has in several

ages made new and strange additions to the Christian faith ; and *their succession of bishops without a succession of faith and worship is little worth.* See p. 350.

. . . There is one mark without which it is impossible we should be certain which is the true church, and that is, that she professes the true faith and worship of Christ. For this is essential to the church, and there can be no church without it ; all other marks may deceive us ; for whatever other marks there be, if there be not the true faith and worship of Christ, there cannot be the true church ; and therefore when the state of the church, as it is at this day is broken and divided into different and opposite communions, whoever will find out the true church must examine her doctrine and worship.—*A Discourse concerning a Judge of Controversies, by Dean Sherlock.* See *Enchir. Theol. Anti-Romanum*, vol. iii. pp. 246, 269.

(209.)—*Recapitulation of the Prophecies relating to Popery, being the concluding remarks of Bishop Newton's Dissertation on the Prophecies.*

Upon the whole it appears that the prophecies relating to Popery are the greatest and most essential, and the most striking part of the Revelation. Whatever difficulty and perplexity there may be in other passages, yet here the application is obvious and easy. Popery being the great corruption of Christianity, there are indeed more prophecies relating to that than to almost any other distant event. It is a great object of Daniel's and the principal object of St Paul's as well as of St. John's prophecies ; and these, considered and compared together, will mutually receive and

reflect light from and upon each other. It will appear to be clearly foretold, that such a power as that of the pope should be exercised in the Christian Church, and should authorize and establish such doctrines and practices as are publicly taught and approved in the Church of Rome. It is not only foretold that such a power should be exercised, but the place and the persons, likewise are pointed out, where and by whom it should be exercised. Besides the place and the persons, the time also is signified when it should prevail, and how long it should prevail, and at last upon the expiration of this term it shall be destroyed for evermore. It is thought proper to represent the prophecies relating to popery in one view, that like the rays of the sun collected in a glass, they may appear with the greater lustre and have the stronger effect.

1. I say, the spirit of prophecy hath signified beforehand, that there should be such a power as that of the Pope and Church of Rome usurped in the Christian world; and these predictions are so plain and express, that, was not the contrary evident and undeniable, they might seem to be penned after the event, and to describe things past rather than to foretel things to come.

For instance. Hath there now for many ages subsisted and doth there still subsist a tyrannical, and idolatrous, and blasphemous power, in pretence Christian but in reality Antichristian? It is the very same power that is pourtrayed in *the little horn* and *the blasphemous king* by Daniel, in *the man of sin the son of perdition*, by St. Paul, and in *the ten-horned beast* and *the two-horned beast*, or *the false prophet* by St. John.

Hath the church apostatized or departed greatly from the purity of Christian faith and worship? It is

the very same thing that St. Paul hath foretold (2 Thess. ii. 3) "The day of the Lord shall not come except there come a falling away (or *the apostacy*) first:" and he saith moreover in another place, (1 Tim. iv. 1) that the Spirit of prophecy (meaning in Daniel) had in express words testified the same thing before, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith," or rather *apostatize from the faith*, and St. John foresaw the church so far degenerated as to become (Rev. xvii. 5) the mother of harlots (or *whoredoms*) and abominations of the earth."

Doth this apostasy consist chiefly in the worshipping of *demons*, angels, and departed saints, and in honouring them with costly shrines and rich offerings, instead of the worship of "the one true God *through* the one true Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus?" Nothing can better agree with the prophecy of St. Paul, (1 Tim. iv. 1), "Some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines concerning demons;" and with the prophecy of Daniel, that the blasphemous king (xi. 38,) "in his estate shall honour Mahuzzim, (god's protectors, or saint's protectors) and a god whom his fathers knew not, shall he honour with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things." —Is the same church that is guilty of this idolatry, notorious also for enjoining celibacy to her clergy, and engaging her nuns to enter into vows of leading a single life? doth she make a vain distinction of meats, and command and institute certain times and days of fasting, wherein to taste flesh is judged a mortal sin? Nothing can more fully accomplish the prediction of Daniel, (xi. 37), "that the blasphemous king who shall worship Mahuzzim shall also not regard the desire

of wives;" and the prediction of St. Paul, (1 Tim. iv. 3,) "that those who shall apostatize from the faith by worshipping of demons, shall no less distinguish themselves by "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth." Doth the pope make himself equal and even superior to God, in affecting divine titles, attributes, and honours; in assuming a power of dispensing with the immutable laws of nature and the gospel; in substituting for the commandments of God the traditions of men; in treading upon the altar of God at his inauguration, and making the table of the Lord his footstool; and in that posture receiving the adoration of his cardinals? It is foretold by Daniel, (vii. 25), that the little horn shall speak great words against the Most High, and think to change times and laws;" and (xi. 36), "the king shall do according to his will, and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and speak marvellous things against the God of gods;" and in like manner by St. Paul, (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.) "The man of sin shall be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."—Have the bishops of Rome extended their authority and jurisdiction over several countries and nations? have they usurped a supremacy over all other bishops? have they partly by menaces and partly by flatteries, obtained an entire ascendancy over Christian princes, so as to have them zealous members of their communion, blindly devoted to their interest, and ready upon all occasions to fight their battles? It is nothing more than was foretold by the prophets; by Daniel, when

he said, (vii. 20), that the little horn " had a mouth speaking very great things, and a look more stout than his fellows ; " and by St. John, when he said (xiii. 7), that " power was given unto the beast over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations," and (xvii. 2), " the kings of the earth have committed fornication," or idolatry with the whore of Babylon ; and (xvii. 13), " have one mind, and shall give their strength and power unto the beast." Hath the Church of Rome enlarged the powers of her clergy, both regular and secular, giving them an almost absolute authority over the purses and consciences of men, enriched them with sumptuous buildings and noble endowments, and appropriated the choicest of the lands for church lands ? This was plainly intimated by Daniel speaking of the blasphemous king, as the passage should be translated, (xi. 39), " Thus shall he do to the defenders of Mahuzzim, together with the strange god whom he shall acknowledge, he shall multiply honour, and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain."

Is the Church of Rome distinguished above all churches by purple and scarlet colour, by the richness and splendour of her vestments, by the pomp and parade of her ceremonies, inciting and inveigling men with all artifices of ornament and ostentation to join in her communion ? this was particularly specified by St. John, speaking of the mystic whore of Babylon, or the corrupted church, (xvii. 4). " And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations, and filthiness of her fornication." Have the bishops and clergy of Rome in all ages been remarkable for their policy ? have they not scrupled to promote their reli-

gion by all manner of lies and pious frauds ? have they allowed of equivocation and mental reservation in oaths and promises, and with the appearance of *lambs* in meekness and sanctity, acted like *ravering wolves*, with fury and violence ? Daniel hath given the same character of the little horn, (vii. 8.) “ Behold in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things ; ” and St. Paul of the apostates in the latter times (1 Tim. iv. 2), “ speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron ; ” and St. John of the two-horned beast, (xiii. 11.) “ And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon.” Doth the Church of Rome boast of visions and revelations, and make a show of miracles in attestation of her doctrines ? do her legends contain as many spurious and pretended wonders, as the Scriptures do genuine and real ? From St. Paul we learn, (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10,) that “ the coming of *the man of sin* is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness ; ” and from St. John (xiii. 13, 14), that the false prophet “ doth great wonders in the sight of men, and deceiveth them who dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he hath power to do.” Doth the Church of Rome require an implicit obedience, condemn all who will not readily conform as heretics ; and excommunicate and exclude them from the civil intercourses of life ? So the false prophet in St. John (xiii. 16, 17,) causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads ; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark of the beast.”

Have the Roman pontiffs occasioned the shedding

of as much or more Christian blood, than the Roman emperors themselves? have they all along maintained their spiritual sovereignty by secret plots and inquisitions, by open dragoonings and massacres, and imprisoned, and tortured, and murdered the true worshippers of God, and the faithful servants of Jesus Christ? This particular, as well as all the rest, exactly answers the predictions of the prophets. For it is affirmed of the little horn in Daniel (vii. 21, 25), that he "shall make war with the saints, and shall prevail against them; shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High;" and the woman in the Revelation, "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots," (xvii. 6,) is represented as "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," and (xviii. 24,) "in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth."

Besides these plain and direct prophecies of the corruptions and innovations of the Church of Rome, there are several secret glances at them, several oblique intendments and intimations of them,—“known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world,” (Acts xv. 18): and when the Holy Spirit dictated to the ancient prophets the prophecies concerning Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, and other tyrannical and corrupt governments, he dictated them in such a manner as plainly evinces that he had a farther view to this last and most tyrannical and corrupt government of all. Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, and the rest, are made the types and emblems of Rome; and many of the particulars predicted concerning the former, are more truly and properly applicable to the latter; and several of them have been applied accordingly by St. John.

Jeremiah said concerning ancient Babylon, (li. 7, 45,) “ Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord’s hand, that made all the earth drunken ; the nations have drunken of her wine ; therefore the nations are mad : my people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord :” but how much more applicable are these expressions, as St. John hath applied them, to mystic Babylon or Rome (xvii. 4 ; xviii. 3, 4) ; “ She hath a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations : all nations have drunk of the poisonous wine of her fornication. Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues !” The prophets themselves might not understand this mystical, and saw perhaps no farther than the literal meaning ; but they “ spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” (2 Peter i. 21), who comprehends all events, the most remote as well as the most immediate. But the intimations of popery, which I particularly meant, are more frequent and more obvious in the New Testament. Why was our blessed Saviour so very cautious in giving honour to the Virgin Mary, that he seemed to regard her less than the least of his disciples ? (Matt. xii. 48), “ Who is my mother ?” (John ii. 4), “ Woman, what have I to do with thee ?” (Luke xi. 27, 28), “ Blessed is the womb that bare thee ; yea, rather blessed are they who hear the word of God, and keep it.” Why did he rebuke St. Peter, more severely than any other of the apostles, (Matt. xvi. 23) ; “ Get thee behind me, Satan ; thou art an offence unto me, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men ;” and especially just after giving him that high encomium, (ver. 18), “ Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church ?” May we not reason-

ably presume that he spake and acted thus, as foreseeing that divine worship which would idolatrously be paid to the one, that supremacy which would be tyrannically arrogated to the other, and which that very encomium would impertinently be brought to countenance?—How came it to pass that our Saviour in instituting his holy supper, (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27), said of the bread, only—“Take, eat;” but of the cup more particularly, “Drink ye all of it?” May we not probably suppose, that it was designed to prevent or obviate their sacrilege, who would have all indeed eat of the bread, but priests only drink of the cup?—Why were the vices of the Scribes and Pharisees left so particularly upon record, if not chiefly for the correction and reproof of their natural issue and descendants, the clergy of the Church of Rome? Read the whole 23rd chapter of St. Matthew, and you will find that there is not a single woe denounced against the former, but as properly belongs, and is as strictly applicable to the latter. “Binding heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and laying them on men’s shoulders; doing all their works to be seen of men; shutting up the kingdom of heaven against men, neither going in themselves, neither suffering them who are entering to go in; devouring widow’s houses, and for a pretence making long prayers; compassing sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made making him twofold more the child of hell than themselves;” making useless and frivolous distinctions of oaths; observing positive duties, and “omitting the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; making clean the outside, but within being full of extortion and excess; outwardly appearing righteous unto men, but within being full of hypocrisy and iniquity; building the tombs of the prophets, and gar-

nishing the sepulchres of the righteous," honouring the dead saints, and at the same time persecuting the living ; are as strong marks and characters of the one sect as they were of the other.—Do not forbidding implicit faith and obedience to men, (Matt. xxiii. 9.) " Call no man your Father upon the earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven ;" forbidding the worship of angels, (Coloss. ii. 18) : " Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of angels ;" forbidding all pretences to works of merit and supererogation, (Luke xvii. 10.) " When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do ;" forbidding the clergy to lord it over God's heritage, (1 Peter iv. 3.) " Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock ;" forbidding the service of God in an unknown tongue, as St. Paul hath done at large in the 14th chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians : do not all these and such like prohibitions, I say, necessarily suppose and imply, that one time or other these particular errors and abuses would creep into the church ? and in what church they are publicly taught and practised, no man can be insensible. Such texts of scripture are as much predictions that these things would be, as they are arguments that they should not be. For laws divine and human are not levelled against chimerical and mere imaginary vices, such as never are, never will be brought into practice ; but are enacted by reason of those enormities, which men either have committed or are likely to commit, and which the lawgivers wisely foreseeing are therefore willing to prevent. Why doth St. Paul admonish the Romans particularly to beware of apostasy ? (Romans xi. 20. 22.) " be not high minded but fear ;—otherwise thou

also shalt be cut off." Surely this is a strange way of addressing the Romans, if the Church of Rome was designed to be the infallible judge of controversies, the centre of unity, and director of all religion. View the picture that both St. Peter and St. Jude have drawn of false teachers, and consider whom it most resembles in all its features. (2 Peter ii. 1.) " But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them ; and many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of ; and through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you, &c." (Jude 4. &c.) " Ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ ; these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities ; these be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit, &c." What St. Paul hath predicted concerning the corruption of the last days, is too much the character of all sects of Christians, but the application more properly belongs to the members of the Church of Rome, (2 Tim. iii. 1. &c.) " this know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come : for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy ; without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good ; traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God ; having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof." Such are the direct prophecies, and such the general intimations of popery ; and we have the better right to make this application of the general in-

timations, as the direct prophecies are so plain and particular.

2. It is not only foretold, that such a power, as that of the pope and Church of Rome should be exercised in the Christian world ; but to prevent any mistake in the application of these prophecies, the place and the persons are likewise pointed out, where and by whom it should be exercised. The prophet Daniel (chap. 7.) hath described " four beasts or four kingdoms : and out of the fourth beast or kingdom, he saith, shall arise ten horns" or ten kings or kingdoms, and " among them (or after them) shall come up another little horn ; and he shall be diverse from the rest ;" and he shall have " eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things, and a look more stout than his fellows ; and he shall subdue and pluck up by the roots three of the first horns (or kings) ; and shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." Daniel's first kingdom is the Babylonian, the second is the Persian, the third is the Macedonian or Grecian, and the fourth can be none other than the Roman ; and the Roman empire, upon its dissolution, was divided into ten kings or kingdoms. It is in the western or Latin empire that these ten kings or kingdoms are to be sought and found : for this was properly the body of the fourth beast ; the Greek or eastern empire belonged to the body of the third beast ; and out of the western Roman empire, by the incursions of the northern nations, arose ten kings or kingdoms : of whom having mentioned the names before, we need not repeat them here. Now, who is the little horn that was to spring up among these or after these ; who as a politico-ecclesiastical power differeth from the other ten powers ; who " hath eyes

like the eyes of a man," that is, a seer, as Sir Isaac Newton says, *εἰσκακῆς* or bishop, in the literal sense of the word ; who " hath a mouth speaking great things," bulls and anathemas, interdicts and excommunications ; who " hath a look more stout than his fellows," assuming a supremacy not only over other bishops, but even a superiority over kings and emperors themselves ; who " hath plucked up by the roots three of the first horns," the exarchate of Ravenna, the kingdom of the Lombards, and the state of Rome, and is distinguished by the triple crown ; who " speaketh great words against the Most High," setting up himself above all laws divine as well as human : who " weareth out the saints of the Most High," by wars and massacres, inquisitions and persecutions, who " changeth times and laws," instituting new religions, and teaching for doctrines the commandments of men ; are questions which I think cannot admit of much dispute ; there is only one person in the world who can fully answer all these characters.

The blasphemous king described in the 11th chapter of Daniel (ver. 36. 39.) who " shall do according to his will, and shall exalt himself and magnify himself, above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper until the indignation be accomplished," who " shall not regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of wives, but in his estate shall honour Mahuzzim, and the defenders of Mahuzzim shall increase with glory, and shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain," is indeed a more general character, comprehending the tyrannical and corrupt power of the eastern church as well as of the western. But when we consider how much and how far the Latin hath prevailed above the Greek church ; how the supremacy

which was first claimed by the patriarch of Constantinople, hath been fully established in the bishop of Rome; how much more absolute the will of the Roman pontiff hath been than that of the Byzantine emperor: how the pope hath exalted himself and magnified himself as a god upon earth; how much more the Latins have degenerated from the religion of their fathers than the Greeks; how the desire of single life and the worship of the dead, which first began in the eastern parts, have been carried to the greatest height in the western empire; how much the jurisdiction and authority the lands and revenues of the Roman clergy have exceeded those of the Greeks; how while the Greek church hath lain oppressed for several centuries, the Roman hath still prospered, and in all probability still may prosper till God's indignation against the Jews be accomplished; in short, when we consider, how entirely this character agrees with that of the little horn, and how much better it agrees with the head of the Roman than with the head of the Greek church, the particular application of it to the Bishop of Rome may well be justified, especially since St. Paul himself hath applied it in the same manner.

St. Paul hath drawn the man of sin the son of perdition, (2 Thess. ii.) an exact copy and resemblance of the little horn and the blasphemous king in Daniel: and this man of sin must necessarily be a Christian, and not a heathen or infidel power, because he is represented "as God sitting in the temple of God." He is described too as the head of the apostacy or the falling away from the faith; and this apostacy is afterwards (1 Tim. iv. 1.) defined by St. Paul to consist in "worshipping of demons;" angels and deceased saints; and no man surely can have any reason to doubt, who is the head and leader of this apostacy,

the patron and authorizer of this worship. The apostle had communicated to the Thessalonians, what it was that hindered his appearing, (ver. 5, 6.) "Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time." What this was the apostle hath no where expressly informed us; but if tradition may be depended upon in any case, it may certainly in this: for it is the constant and current tradition of the fathers, that what withholdeth is the Roman empire: and therefore the primitive Christians in the public offices of the church prayed for its peace and welfare, as knowing that when the Roman empire should be broken into pieces the empire of the man of sin would be raised on its ruins. They made no question, they were fully persuaded, that the successor of the Roman emperor in Rome would be the man of sin; and who hath succeeded to the Roman emperor in Rome, let the world judge and determine.

St. John too hath copied after Daniel, and (chap. 13.) exhibits the Roman empire under the same emblem of a beast with ten horns. It is evident that he designed the same as Daniel's fourth or last beast, because he represents him as a composition of the three former, with the body of a leopard, the feet of a bear, and the mouth of a lion. He describes him too with the qualities and properties of the little horn, speaking the same blasphemies, acting the same cruelties: and having plainly seen what power was intended by the one, we have the less reason to hesitate about the other. But to distinguish him yet more, the number of his name is defined to be six hundred and sixty-six. It was an ancient practice to denote names by numbers; and this number must be resolvable into some Greek or Hebrew name, to which all the characters here

given may agree. It is an early tradition derived from Irenæus, who lived not long after St. John's time, and was a disciple of a disciple of this apostle, that the number 666 includes the Greek name Lateinos or the Latin empire. Or if you prefer a Hebrew name, as St. John hath sometimes made use of Hebrew names, it is no less remarkable that this number comprehends also the Hebrew name Romüth or the Roman empire. For more clearness and sureness still, a woman is shewn (chap. 17.) riding upon this same beast, and her name is Babylon the great : but Babylon was destroyed long before, and by Babylon all agree, was meant Rome. The seven heads of the beast are likewise explained to be "seven mountains on which the woman sitteth," which all the world know to be the situation of Rome. The woman herself is also declared "to be that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth;" and that can be none other than Rome. Indeed the Papists themselves allow (for they cannot but allow) all this to be said of Rome, but then they argue and maintain it to be said of Heathen Rome. But that cannot be ; because it agrees not with several circumstances of the prophecy, and particularly with the woman's sitting upon the beast with "ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns," which must needs typify the Roman empire, after it was divided into ten kingdoms, but the Roman empire was not divided into ten kingdoms till some years after it became Christian. St. John with the eyes of prophecy saw this beast "rise up out of the sea," and the angel in his exposition saith that he "shall ascend out of the bottomless pit;" but Heathen Rome had risen and flourished many years before this time. This beast cannot represent Heathen Rome because he is successor to Heathen Rome, to the great red dragon in "his power,

and his seat, and great authority." This beast was to continue and prosper forty-two prophetic months, that is 1260 years; but Heathen Rome did not continue 400 years after this time. The woman is represented as the mother of idolatry, with her golden cup intoxicating the inhabitants of the earth; but Heathen Rome ruled more with a rod of iron, and was rather an importer of foreign gods and superstitions than an exporter to other nations. St. John "wondered with great admiration," when he "saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;" but wherefore should he, who had seen and suffered the persecutions under Nero, wonder so much that Heathens should persecute Christians; but that Christians should delight in shedding the blood of Christians, was indeed of all wonders the greatest. The woman rideth upon the beast under his seventh head, or last form of government; but the sixth head, which was the imperial form of government, is said to be subsisting in St. John's time, and the sixth was not destroyed, and the seventh or last form did not take place, till after Rome was become Christian. The ten kings with "one mind gave their power and strength unto the beast," and afterwards "hate the whore and make her desolate, and burn her with fire;" but never did any ten kings unanimously and voluntarily submit to Heathen Rome, and afterwards burn her with fire. Rome, according to the prophecies, is to be utterly burnt with fire, and to be made a desolation for ever and ever—but Rome hath never yet undergone this fate, and consequently Heathen Rome cannot be the subject of these prophecies. In short from these and all other characters and circumstances, some whereof can never agree with Heathen Rome, and all agree perfectly with Christian

Rome, it may and must be concluded, that not Heathen but Christian, not imperial but Papal Rome was intended by these visions.

3. Besides the place and the persons, the time also is signified of this tyrannical power, when it should prevail, and how long it should prevail. Daniel mentions these things as being at a very great distance, and indeed they were at a very great distance in his time. It is said (viii. 26.; x. 24.) "the vision is yet for many days;" that it comprehends (viii. 29.) "what shall be in the last end of the indignation;" that it extends (xi. 35. 40.; xii. 4. 9.) "even to the time of the end;" that when God (xii. 7.) "shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished;" all which and other passages to the same purpose considered, it appears as unaccountable as strange, that every man should imagine, as some both ancients and moderns have imagined, that Daniel's prophecies reached not beyond the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. Daniel hath described four great empires, not contemporary, but successive one to another. The fourth and last is represented as the greatest of all, both in extent and duration. "It devoureth the whole earth and treadeth it down, and breaketh it in pieces." After which it is divided into ten kingdoms, and the little horn groweth not up till after this division. So that this tyrannical power was to arise in the latter days of the Roman empire, after it should be divided into ten kingdoms. From St. Paul too we may collect, that the great power of the Roman empire hindered the appearing of the man of sin: but when that power should be diminished and "taken out of the way," then should "the man of sin be revealed in his time." St. John also refers these events to the same era. Not only the gene-

ral order and the whole series of his prophecies point to this time, but there are besides particular intimations of it. He describes the beast as successor to the great red dragon, in "his power, and his seat, and great authority:" but if the great red dragon be, as he is generally understood to be, the persecuting power of Heathen Rome, then the persecuting power of Heathen Rome must be removed, before the beast can take his place. The beast hath also "ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns;" so that ten complete kingdoms must arise out of the Roman empire before the appearance of the beast. Of his seven heads it is said, "five are fallen (that is, in St. John's time five forms of government were past,) one is and the other is not yet come," and the sixth which was then present being the imperial, it necessarily follows that the seventh or last must be some form of government which must arise after the imperial; and as St. John saw the one, we see the other.

It appears then that this Antichristian power was to arise in the latter times of the Roman empire, after an end should be put to the imperial power, and after the empire should be divided into ten kingdoms: and it is not only foretold when it should prevail, but moreover how long it should prevail. Here we cannot but observe, that the very same period of time is prefixed for its continuance both by Daniel and by St. John. Wonderful is the consent and harmony between these inspired writers, as in other circumstances of the prophecy, so particularly in this. In Daniel (vii. 25.) the little horn was to "wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws;" and it is said expressly, that they "should be given into his hand, until a time, and times, and the dividing of time," or as the same thing is expressed in another

place, (xii. 7.) "for a time, times, and a half." In the Revelation it is said of the beast, (xiii. 5.) to whom in like manner "it was given to make war with the saints, and to overcome them," that "power also was given unto him to continue forty and two months." And "the holy city (xi. 2.) the Gentiles should tread under foot forty and two months:" and the two witnesses, (ver. 3.) should prophecy a thousand two hundred and three-score days clothed in sackcloth:" and the woman the true church of Christ, who fled into the wilderness from persecution, (xii. 6, 14,) should be fed and nourished there "a thousand two hundred and three-score days," or as it is otherwise expressed in the same chapter, "for a time, and times, and half a time." Now all these numbers you will find upon computation to be the same, and each of them to signify 1260 years. For a time is a year, and a time, and times, and the dividing of time, or half a time, are three years and a half, and three years and a half are forty-two months, and forty-two months are 1260 days, and 1260 days, in the prophetic style, are 1260 years. From all these dates and characters, it may fairly be concluded, that the time of the church's great affliction, and of the reign of Antichrist, will be a period of 1260 years.

To fix the time exactly when these 1260 years begin, and consequently when they will end, is a matter of some niceness and difficulty; and perhaps we must see their conclusion, before we can precisely ascertain their beginning. However, it appears to be a very great mistake of some very learned men in dating the commencement of this period too early. This is the capital error of Mr. Mede's scheme; what hath led him, and others, who have followed his example, into subsequent errors; and what the event hath

plainly refuted. For if the reign of Antichrist had begun, as he reckons, about the year 456, its end would have fallen out about the year 1716, the truth is, these 1260 years are not to be reckoned from the beginning of these corruptions, from the rise of this tyranny, for "the mystery of iniquity began to work" even in the days of the apostles; but from their full growth and establishment in the world. Of the little horn, who was "to wear out the saints of the Most High, and to change times and laws," it is said that "they should be given into his hand," which can imply no less than the most absolute power and authority over them, "until a time, and times, and the dividing of time."

In like manner the holy city, the true church of Christ, was to be "trodden under foot," which is the lowest state of subjection; the two witnesses were not only to prophesy, but to "prophesy in sackcloth," that is in mourning and affliction; the woman, the church, was to abide "in the wilderness," that is in a forlorn and desolate condition; and "power was given to the beast," *ποιῆσαι* not merely "to continue," as it is translated, but to practise and prosper, and to do according to his will; and all for this same period of 1260 years. These 1260 years, therefore, of the reign of Antichrist are not to be computed from his birth, or infancy, or youth; but from his coming to maturity; from his coming to the throne: and in my opinion their beginning cannot be fixed consistent with the truth of history, either sooner or later than in the eighth century. Several memorable events happened in that century. In the year 727, the pope and people of Rome revolted from the exarch of Ravenna, and shook off their allegiance to the Greek emperor. In the year 755, the pope obtained the exarchate of

Ravenna for himself, and thenceforwards acted as an absolute temporal prince. In the year 774, the pope, by the assistance of Charles the Great, became possessed of the kingdom of the Lombards. In the year 787, the worship of images was fully established, and the supremacy of the pope acknowledged by the second council of Nice. From one or other of these transactions, it is probable, that the beginning of the reign of Antichrist is to be dated. What appears to be most probable is, that it is to be dated from the year 727, when (as Sigonius says) ‘Rome and the Roman dukedom came from the Greeks to the Roman pontiff.’ Hereby he became in some measure a horn or temporal prince, though his power was not fully established till some years afterwards; and before he was a horn at all, he could not answer the character of the little horn. If then the beginning of the 1260 years of the reign of Antichrist is to be dated from the year 727, their end will fall near the year 2000 after Christ; and at the end of the 6000th year of the world, according to a very early tradition of Jews and Christians, and even of heathens, great changes and revolutions are expected both in the natural and in the moral world; and “there remaineth, according to the words of the apostle, (Heb. iv. 9,) “a sabbatism, or holy rest to the people of God.

4th. What Daniel hath described under the character of the little horn, and the blasphemous king: what St. Paul hath described under the character of the man of sin, the son of perdition; what St. John hath described under the character of the beast, and the false prophet; that same tyrannical, idolatrous, and blasphemous power, ecclesiastical writers usually denominate Antichrist: and having thus far traced his character and description, his rise, progress, and con-

tinuance, let us now proceed to consider his fall, when at the expiration of the prefixed period of 1260 years his kingdom shall be destroyed for evermore. The prophets are not more expressive of his elevation, than they are of his destruction. They not only predict his downfall in general terms, but also describe the manner and circumstances of it; and St. John's account being larger and more circumstantial and particular, will be the best comment and explanation of the others. For my part, I cannot pretend to prophesy, which is the common vanity of expositors of the Revelation; I can only represent events in the order wherein, according to my apprehension, the prophets have placed them. Sobriety and modesty are required in the interpretation of all prophecies, and especially in the explication of things yet future. Only this much it may be proper to premise, that having seen so many of the prophecies fulfilled, you have the less reason to doubt of the completion of those which are to follow.

. . . . Since then the corruptions of popery are so particularly foretold in Scripture, and make so considerable a part of the ancient prophecies, we have the less reason to be surprised and offended at them. While the Papists endeavour to corrupt and adulterate the doctrines of the prophets and apostles, they still accomplish their predictions, while they labour to destroy Christianity in one part, they unwittingly confirm and establish it in another. And since a time is certainly coming, wherein God will avenge himself on these idolaters, and require the blood of his servants at their hands, let us wait with "the patience and the faith of saints," till it be accomplished. We have seen the prophecies remarkably fulfilled in their success, and we shall see them as remarkably fulfilled

too in their destruction. The power of the pope is nothing near so great now as it was some ages ago : it received its death wound at the Reformation, of which it may languish for a time, but will never entirely recover, though its last struggles and efforts, like those of a dying monster, may be terrible and dangerous. In the end, the gospel will prevail over all enemies and opposers. (Matt. xxi. 44.)—"Who-soever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." We will conclude our discourse with the words of Ezra, so very applicable to us of the reformed religion, (ix. 13, 14.)—"After all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God hast punished us less than our iniquities deserve, and hast given us such deliverance as this (a deliverance from the yoke and tyranny of the Church of Rome;) should we again break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the people of these abominations, wouldst thou not be angry with us till thou hadst consumed us, so that there should be no remnant nor escaping?"—*Bishop Newton on the Prophecies : Dobson's Edition*, pp. 604, 624.

APPENDIX.

A Dissertation on 2 Thess. ii. 1.—12. in which it is shewn that the Bishop of Rome is the MAN OF SIN. That the whole prophecy, in that chapter, is applicable to him and his adherents, and to them alone. Nor can we at this day, describe the apostasy of the Church of Rome in a more concise and lively manner than the apostle has done in that short and remarkable prophecy.—By GEORGE BENSON, D.D.

2 Thess. ii. 1.—12.—Popery, however artfully disguised in Protestant countries, and where there is liberty for free inquiry, continues still to be a most corrupt and tyrannical religion, in places where it is established and protected by the sword of the magistrate.

As the apostles had the prophetic spirit in the highest degree, and popery is such a notorious corruption of Christianity, a corruption which has spread so far and wide, and continued so long in the world ; one would naturally expect to find predictions, in their writings, concerning this *Grand Apostasy*, to prevent the true Christians of later ages from being shocked at the appearance of so disagreeable a state of things. Such a prophecy, as I apprehend, is contained in this chapter ; ver. 1.—12.

St. Paul planted the Christian Church at Thessalonica.

After he had left that place, the Christians fell into a mistake, concerning the coming of the day of the Lord, imagining that St. Paul thought it to be just at hand. To rectify that mistake he sent this second epistle, in which he acquaints them that *that* day could not be so near, because a great and remarkable *apostasy* was first to happen in the Christian Church.

That the day of Christ, ver. 2. doth not refer to our Lord's coming to destroy Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, will plainly appear, if we look into the rise and progress of this mistake. In the former Epistle, iv. 13. &c., the apostle dissuaded the Thessalonians from an excessive sorrow, upon the death of their friends; such as the heathens were commonly guilty of, putting them in mind of the Christian promise of a glorious resurrection to eternal life. When that resurrection and complete happiness will commence, he there informs them, viz. at the coming of the Lord, when the Christians, who shall be then found alive upon the earth, shall be transformed; as well as the dead be raised, and the righteous all made happy. Having mentioned that coming of the Lord, or of the day of the Lord, he, in the beginning of the fifth chapter, goes on with his discourse about that day; assuring them that it would come suddenly and surprisingly, and that, as the particular time was unknown, men should always be prepared; but he said nothing there, how nigh, or how distant, he apprehended it to be; and, very probably, from that his silence arose the mistake of the Christians at Thessalonica.

As soon as the apostle understood that they had mistaken his meaning, he wrote to them this second letter; the principal design of which was to set them right about this point. And he seems to have been very solicitous to set them right in this particular lest they should have been tempted to have thrown off

Christianity itself, when they should find that the event did not happen, according to their expectations. When he was among them, he had told them that a *grand apostasy* was to happen : and therefore the day of the Lord was at some distance. That prophecy he now repeats, and intimates to them that it was a plain proof of the distance of that great day. If therefore the day, or coming of the Lord, 1 Thess. iv. 15. &c., and v. 1. &c., ought to be understood of the day of judgment, when Christ shall descend, the dead shall be raised, and the generation then living transformed ; as it certainly ought to be : I think it evident, that it ought so to be understood in this place also ; for of the same day , and the same coming of the Lord he appears to be speaking in both the epistles. And, what may further confirm this, is, that by that day, or the coming of the Lord, is generally meant his coming to judge the world. As, therefore, this is the usual meaning of the phrase, in other places of the New Testament, and the most evident meaning of it in these two epistles to the Thessalonians ; we have no occasion, upon that account, to look for the man of sin, and the *grand apostasy*, before the destruction of Jerusalem ; as they are obliged to do, who understand this coming of the Lord to refer to the destruction of that city. None of the seven following interpretations of this prophecy appear to me to be well grounded.

1. Grotius would persuade us that Caius Caligula was the man of sin, here prophesied of. Whereas, according to the account of all the latest and best chronologers, this epistle was written about twelve years after the death of that emperor. It could not, therefore, surely be a prophecy of the wickedness and cruelty of Caligula.

2. Dr. Hammond would have Simon Magus and the Gnostics to be here designed ; but Simon Magus had

already showed himself an enemy to Christianity at Samaria; and therefore was not yet to be revealed. And as to his conflict with St. Peter at Rome, and many of the doctor's stories about the Gnostics, they seem to be built upon too sandy a foundation to deserve any great regard. Dr. Whitby and Mr. LeClerc have abundantly confuted that interpretation.

Grotius's introducing Simon Magus, ver. 8, 9. is as groundless, for the apostle doth there evidently continue to speak of the same person that he had begun with, ver. 3, 4; and if Grotius saw that the whole prophecy could not agree either to Caligula, or to Simon Magus and his deluded followers, I think he ought, in his interpretation, to have referred no part of it to either of them.

3. Others would have the unbelieving Jews, who persecuted the Christians before the destruction of Jerusalem, and made many of them apostatize to Judaism, to be the man of sin, &c. But this interpretation appears to me to be not well grounded. For the unbelieving Jews, though they did, indeed, persecute the Christians, yet they were not united under any one eminent head or leader. They were never able to exalt themselves above all that is called a God, or an emperor, *i. e.* above all the kings and potentates upon earth: Nor had they after this time, any one person among them, who sate in the temple of God, shewing and manifesting himself to be a God or to be possessed of the power of a king, or temporal monarch.

Nor doth St. Paul appear to me to be by any means he that letted, ver. 6, 7; for the unbelieving Jews persecuted the Christians after his conversion, as well as before it; nor could he prevent the *apostasy* of the Jewish Christians by labouring, as he generally did, among the gentile churches.

Besides, in the prophecy of St. Paul, the *apostasy*

was, in a great degree, at least, to precede the revelation of the Man of Sin; whereas, the persecuting anti-christian spirit of the unbelieving Jews was revealed, or manifested, before the apostasy of the Jewish Christians.

And, finally, 'tis a grand objection with me against that interpretation, that by the man of sin's appearing, and being revealed, is understood his perishing and destruction, in as much as St. Paul hath clearly distinguished his coming, and the continuance of his power, from the punishment and perdition which would be, at last, inflicted on him by the Lord.

4. Others, again, would have the unbelieving Jews who revolted from the Romans, together with the Jewish converts who apostatized from the Christians to the Jewish religion to be the persons here prophesied of. Whereas, what the apostle is here speaking of, was an apostasy from the true religion. For so the *Αποστασία* signifieth in other places of the New Testament: and what will lead us to understand it so in this place, is, that it was to be carried on by sham miracles, and all the deceivableness of unrighteousness, and should prevail only among vicious persons, who had an enmity to truth, and loved lies and wickedness. But the unbelieving Jews could not apostatize from the Christian religion; because they had never embraced it, and the Jewish Christians who did apostatize had no eminent head or leader, that deserved the name of the man of sin, &c. Dr. Whitby, who is the most considerable advocate for this interpretation, plays between the two; and brings in the unbelieving Jews revolting from the Romans, or the Jewish Christians falling away from Christianity, just as may best help him out in his hypothesis. But the prophecy itself is uniform, and describes one sort of apostasy, quite throughout.

5. As Mahomet himself did never profess the Christian religion, he could not be called an apostate. However, as he made many Christians to apostatize, and built his religion partly upon the ruin and corruption of Christianity, he might, in some sense, be said to sit in the temple of God. He likewise, though he pretended to be an extraordinary prophet, showed himself to be in reality no prophet, but a temporal prince, and he arose after the downfall of the Roman empire; which I take to have been the *το κατεχον* that which hindered the appearance of the man of sin. All this may be said in favour of them who understand this as a prophecy of Mahomet. But then, 1. Suppose that St. John and St. Paul prophecied of the same thing, as I think they did, 'tis evident that Rome must be the seat of the grand impostor. For, Rev. xvii. 9. 18. the city, which stood upon seven hills, and then reigned over the kings of the earth, was to be the seat of this tyrannical power. 2. It is a sufficient argument against applying this prophecy to Mahomet, that this wicked one was to come after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, *i. e.* with great pretensions to miracles. Whereas Mahomet did not pretend to establish himself and his imposture by miracles. For, though several miracles are ascribed to him by the fabulous and legendary writers among the Mahometans, yet their learned men renounce them all. Nor doth Mahomet himself, in the Koran, lay any claim to them.

6. Though Rome heathen opposed Christianity very much, and the emperors exalted themselves above all the kings and princes upon the earth; yet this their exaltation was not a thing then to be revealed. Neither did they apostatize from Christianity, nor sit in the temple of God, nor pretend to establish their power by miracles.

7. The Papists, in their annotations on the Rhemish New Testament, interpret this apostasy to be the falling away of the Protestants from the Church of Rome. And so by a strange legerdemain, we are to be the Man of Sin, or his forerunners at least. Whereas, it doth not certainly appear that there was any Christian church at Rome, when St. Paul wrote this second epistle to the Thessalonians. Nor are we united under any one common head upon earth; nor do we pretend to establish our doctrine by miracles. These and many other things plainly show, that 'tis ridiculous to apply this prophecy to the Reformation from Popery.

As we have rejected these misinterpretations, the next thing is to point out the apostle's meaning. And, however difficult it may appear, upon a transient reading, to fix the sense of so short and general a prophecy as this; I will venture to say, that no prophecy could have been more exactly accomplished, than this hath been, in the Bishop of Rome and his adherents. And therefore, as it agrees to them, and the whole of it to them only, there is the greatest reason to think that it was designed for them; especially as it is a singular event, the like to which never happened before, and, most probably, never will happen again.

But let us go over the several parts of the prophecy. Ver. 3. "Before the coming of the day of the Lord, there was to happen a falling away or an *apostasy*." And, accordingly, what an *apostasy* from the true Christian worship, doctrine, and practice, hath happened; and is supported by the Church of Rome? Instead of worshipping God with simplicity, and in spirit and truth, they have introduced external pomp and numerous ceremonies, which strike upon the senses, and engage the attention, without mending the heart.

Instead of worshipping God through Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and man, they have substituted the doctrine of demons, i. e. the spirits of men departed out of this life, who, as they pretend, intercede with God for us, and they invoke the Virgin Mary more frequently than God himself. They have not only succeeded Rome heathen, in the seat of empire, but have also apostatized into their imagery and idolatry. Though they have, indeed, disguised it with new names and different pretensions.

Instead of the Christian doctrine, they have apostatized from the faith, and in many countries taken from the common people the liberty of reading the Scriptures in their mother tongue; that they might, with the more ease, propagate their own delusions.

For, having, in a forcible and violent manner, restrained the liberty of private judgment, they have with less difficulty substituted, instead of the most excellent doctrine of the gospel, their own articles of faith, and the forged traditions and lying legends of their church. And not content barely to propagate ignorance, they have dared most impudently to commend it, and called it the mother of devotion.

Their encouraging the apostasy in practice, will be taken notice of in the sentences that immediately follow

THIS GRAND APOSTASY was to proceed gradually to its height; but when it came to such a pitch, then was to be revealed one who should deservedly be called the Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition.

That this phrase may denote a succession of persons, one after another, though but one at a time, may appear from Deut. xvii. 14—20, where that phrase, the king of Israel, must be understood, not of one king only, but of a succession of kings; and from several texts, where the Jewish High Priest is spoken

of as one person, though any one in that succession of high priests is thereby intended. And to whom can the title of the man of sin so properly belong, as to the succession of the bishops of Rome, for many past centuries? There have been among them, not only some of the vilest of mankind, notorious for their cruelty, infidelity, debauchery, simony, and all manner of wickedness; but by their indulgences, pardons, and dispensations, which they claim a power from Christ of granting, and which they have sold in so infamous a manner, they have encouraged all manner of vile and wicked practices. Instead of shewing men the necessity of sincere repentance, unfeigned faith, and an holy life and conversation, they have contrived numberless methods to render an holy life entirely needless, to indulge men in the greatest and most abominable vices, and yet assure them of heaven, even without a thorough repentance, provided they will pay them sufficient for their admission.

The form of indulgences, a little before the Reformation, was so ample, that rich men were unconcerned what sins they committed, as knowing that they could, living or dead, purchase a pardon. For, suppose they neglected it in their life-time, it was but leaving so much money by will, at their death, for masses and indulgences, and they were assured that all would be forgiven them. Can such notorious wickedness always escape without an eminent perdition?

How justly may present Rome, for her persecution, idolatry, and notorious wickedness, be deemed mystical Babylon, and be (spiritually or figuratively) called Sodom and Egypt, (where wickedness hath risen to an amazing height, and the people of God have been under a long and cruel bondage,) and the mother of fornications, and of the abominations of the earth?

Verse 4, if rightly translated, would, I think, have run thus, ‘ who opposes himself, i. e. to Christ, and exalts himself above every one that is called a God, or, even the imperial dignity, so that he, as a God, sits enthroned in the temple of God, shewing himself to be a God.’ Who opposes himself, that is, to Christ and true Christians. And who have done this more than the Church of Rome? Witness their infamous crusades, and the cruel massacres of the Albigenses and Waldenses, of whom they are said to have slain above nine hundred thousand.

In about thirty years from the first founding of the order of Jesuits, above eight hundred thousand of the Protestants were put to death by the hand of the executioner only ; besides great numbers who perished several other ways, of whom we have now no particular account remaining. The Duke of Alva boasted of his having, in a few years, cut off thirty-six thousand Protestants in the Netherlands.

The horrible and infernal court of Inquisition is said, in about thirty years, to have consumed one hundred and fifty thousand by various kinds of torments, and still remains in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and other places, on purpose to hinder all free inquiry, and to keep mankind in the greatest ignorance of the true religion, and in a most slavish subjection to an hierarchy of ambitious, lazy, and debauched priests.

The cruel imprisonment, scourging, and burning of the martyrs here in England, and the horrid and prodigious massacres in France and Ireland, can never surely be forgot. . No benevolent person can read the accounts, at this distance of time, without weeping eyes and a bleeding heart.

Persecution is a distinguishing character of this *apostate*. If to “ wear out the saints of the Most High,” and to slay such as are “ witnesses ” for truth,

virtue, and liberty, and that bear their testimony against impositions, violence, and persecution; if to "make war with the saints," and frequently "to prevail against, and overcome them," and even to "be drunk with the blood of the saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus;" if these things, I say, can possibly be accomplished, they have been and still are accomplished by the cruel tyrannical Church of Rome.

By "every one that is called a God," must be understood earthly magistrates, or temporal princes; for Θεός without the article, doth often signify a god, and here it is evidently opposed to ὁ Θεός the God, or the one true God, in whose temple this man of sin was to sit. So, Psalm lxxxii. 6, 7. "I have said, ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High; but ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." And, verse 1, of that Psalm, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, he judges among the gods."

But as Σεβασμα seems plainly to be an allusion to Σεβαστος, the Greek name of the Cæsars, or Roman Emperors; 'tis possible that the apostle might, in both the phrases, refer to the Roman Emperors, who, after their deaths, were, most of them, enrolled among the gods. Nay, Caius, before his death, laid claim to divinity, and would needs be acknowledged and worshipped as a god.

That, by the temple of God, where this impostor was to fix his seat, may be understood the Christian church, will appear, if it be considered, that the Christian Church is, in the New Testament, often called the temple of God, or compared to the temple. And in this temple it is prophesied, that the man of sin would exalt himself above all temporal magistrates, kings, and emperors; and it is very easy to

point out the accomplishment of this part of the prophecy; for how proudly hath the bishop of Rome thus exalted himself, and been styled by his flatterers and vile dependents, a god, who ought not be called to an account; the supreme deity on earth; King of kings, and Lord of lords, by whom princes reign, and upon whom the right of kings depends? Nay, the *Glossator* upon the canon law hath given him the high and blasphemous title, of our Lord God the pope. And the popes have acted accordingly, absolving subjects from their allegiance to their lawful princes, fomenting and raising rebellions, deposing or murdering rightful princes, and setting up others in their stead. With what pride and haughtiness have they called emperors their vassals, and even obliged some of them to hold the bridle till the pope has mounted his horse, or to bear up his train after him, when his holiness has been pleased to walk in a pompous procession. Nay, with what amazing insolence have the Romish priests whipped kings and sovereign princes, and the pope has even set his foot upon an emperor's neck. He has claimed the sole right of nominating, investing, or confirming the princes and rulers of the earth.

If this be not to "exalt himself above all that is called a god," or an emperor, there can be no event to answer this or any prophesy whatever.

I think *Σεβασμα* was designed to refer to the Roman emperor. But if we understand it, as some do, of objects of, or things pertaining to, religious worship, the prophecy is still accomplished; for doth not the bishop of Rome claim the sole power of ordaining sacraments, consecrating altars and images, canonizing saints, and appointing what sort of religious worship shall be paid, as well as to whom? Otherwise, how comes it to pass, that the Virgin Mary is more fre-

quently invoked than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Is not this, most evidently, a religious tyranny, founded in, and still supported by, the pretence of religion? Other potentates have sometimes called in religion for a pretence, and laid aside that pretence, when their purpose has been served; but no tyranny, besides this, hath been entirely founded in, and all along carried on, merely by a pretence to religion. And how exactly has the apostle prophesied of this! When he foretold, that he would sit in the temple of God (not a *god*, or temporal potentate, but) *as a god*, i. e. under another, a religious pretence, he would lay claim to the power of a temporal monarch, *in ordine ad spiritualia*, under the pretence of being the head of the Catholic Church, and having all spiritual power, he would thus exalt himself. And, I need not say, that under this colour, the bishop of Rome has claimed a most exorbitant power, and that herein this his kingdom is diverse from all kingdoms; for other princes rule in their own dominions by their temporal power. But, under the notion of spiritual power, the pope claims obedience in kingdoms and countries, where a foreign temporal prince could have no claim; so that, though he does not directly pretend to be a god, or a temporal prince, yet he shews himself to be one, and hath often been, in reality, possessed of equal or greater power.

From our saying, that ‘by the temple of God, in this prophecy, is meant the Christian Church,’ Bel-larmine would infer, ‘that then the Church of Rome must be the Church of God, for there the pope sitteth upon his throne.’ But his argument is vain and frivolous, and no more will hence follow, than that the Church of Rome may be called the ‘Church of God,’ in the same sense that an adulterous woman may be called a wife; or, as the greatest corruptions may

retain the names which were given in the times of the greatest simplicity and purity.

Ver. 6. "And ye know what now hinders, that he may be revealed in his own proper season." From St. Paul's cautious and covert manner of speaking, lest he should offend the higher powers, as well as from other arguments, it is highly probable that the Roman emperors were the obstructing power. And it is remarkable, that, upon that very account, the primitive Christians used to pray for the continuance of the Roman empire, viz. "to hinder the appearance of antichrist."

Tertullian, who flourished towards the conclusion of the second century, saith, 'Now the mystery of iniquity worketh, only he who letteth will let till he be taken out of the way. What is this,' says he, 'but the Roman empire?'

And St. Jerome, when he heard that Rome was taken by Alaricus the Goth, shewed plainly, that he expected the appearance of antichrist, upon the removal of the Roman empire, and wondered that it was not more speedy. 'For,' says he, 'he that hindered, is taken out of the way, and yet we do not understand that antichrist approaches.'

Ver. 7. "For the mystery of iniquity already works; only there is one that obstructs, till he be taken out of the way."

It is impossible for us to know more of the tendency towards this *grand apostasy* in the apostle's days, than the apostles or primitive Christians have mentioned in their writings. Hymeneus and Alexander subverted the Christians by teaching false doctrines. Diotrophes aspired after the preeminence. Demas over-loved this present world. Others are charged with making a gain of godliness; some by a false humility fell into the worship of angels; others placed religion in a dis-

tinction between meats and drinks, forbidding to marry, and enjoining abstinence from such things as God allows; and, finally, many others placed their religion in festivals and new moons, in a distinction between days and weeks, months and years, not considering that "the kingdom of God consisted in righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." From such corruptions of Christianity, it was, that St. John said, "There were then many antichrists." As we know what the *apostasy* is at its height, we may justly conclude, that every corruption in worship, faith, or practice, was a making way for this *apostasy*; somewhat of the spirit of the Man of Sin, or the mystery of iniquity then working. And, according to this part of the prophecy, it is well known, that they have not arrived to their grand corruption of Christianity, but step by step; and at the first by slow and almost insensible degrees.

Ver. 8. "And then shall be revealed that wicked one," or lawless person, and 'tis notoriously evident, that the removal of the Roman emperors did actually open the way for the advancement of the Bishop of Rome to his power and grandeur. Then was that wicked one signally revealed. ὁ ἀνόμιμος, that lawless person; how proper a title for him who hath been declared to be subject to no law, but that he can, by the plenitude of his power, make right wrong, and wrong right; virtue vice, and vice virtue; that he can dispense with all laws, human and divine. And that he may do all things above law, against law, and without law.

Ver. 9. "Whom the Lord will consume by the breath of his mouth, and will utterly abolish by the brightness of his coming." These words must be considered as thrown in by way of parenthesis; or else, his destruction mentioned in this verse, will be placed

before his coming, and exalting himself to such power by the most wicked and deceitful methods, mentioned in the next verse. And I suppose that it was thrown in to comfort the Christians under such a prospect, by the assured hopes of this tyranny coming to an end.

As the last sentence was inserted by way of parenthesis, we may go on with the principal subject, as if it had not been there—verses 9, 10, 11, 12. When the obstructing power is removed, then shall that wicked one be revealed, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders; and with the most fraudulent and unrighteous cheats; though none need to be deluded thereby, if they are lovers of truth and virtue.

The many pretences to miracles in the Church of Rome have abundantly fulfilled this. They have asserted that churches have been taken up in one place, and carried through the air into distant countries. That images have nodded, smiled, frowned, or spoken upon occasion. That the blood of a saint hath been annually liquified on a certain day of the year. That the first convert St. Gaul made in Germany was a bear. That St. Anthony of Padua preached to a vast assembly of fishes, whom he had miraculously called together, and who devoutly heard him preach the word of the Lord. That St. Francis preached with great success to birds and beasts, which he thought our Lord had commanded, (Mark xvi. 15), when he bade the apostles to “Go into all the world, and to preach the gospel to every creature.”

Numberless have been the fictitious apparitions of the souls of dead men, in order to prove such a state as purgatory. Nay, to prove this, what have they not pretended to? Voices from heaven or hell, cures at the shrines of their saints, or by their bones and relics, to which they have sometimes ascribed the power to

raise persons from the dead ! All the legends and lying wonders, which the most diabolical invention could contrive, have been made use of, to found and support this notorious *apostasy*.

For my own part I question the reality of all their miracles. But suppose any of them to be real, a miracle only sheweth that some being interposes who is superior in power to man. And, as we must judge by the doctrine and practice they would promote, whether miracles are worked by a good or a bad spirit, 'tis evident that, if they work any real miracles, they are assisted by a malevolent and wicked spirit, because they would thereby promote ignorance and falsehood, idolatry and wickedness.

They have, likewise by the most unrighteous deceit, appeared as professed friends to Christianity, though really its greatest enemies.

They have canonized men for saints, who have been the most flagitious sinners. And have consecrated murders, treasons, massacres, and rebellions, by promising their votaries, that they should not pass through the fire of purgatory, but should have immediate entrance into heaven, suppose they should be cut off in perpetrating such black and horrid crimes.

It were endless to mention their pious frauds, and specious astonishing methods to increase their number ; to draw in the worst of men, and to discourage the best ; in order to gratify their own exorbitant lust of power and ambition.

And must not men have cast off the love of truth, who can delight in their fabulous traditions, and monstrous lying legends, and tamely give up the Scriptures, or speak of them with contempt ?

Thus have I briefly gone through the several parts of this prophecy, and shewn, I think, that no prophecy can be more exactly accomplished.

COROLLARIES.

1. "From what hath been said, 'tis easy to judge concerning Popery and the Reformation." It is not the largeness of a church, nor her external pomp and splendour which makes her the true church; nor are they always the schismatics who are the fewest in number. No, suppose all the nations of the earth should generally agree together, in maintaining absurd doctrines, immoral and unreasonable practices, uncharitableness and impositions, they are properly the heretics and schismatics; and let the number who separate from them, in defence of truth, virtue, liberty, and charity, be never so few, they are in reality the *true* church, and the other is only a grand *schism*, or worldly faction; even though their party be as numerous as that with the soles of their feet they could dry up rivers.

Holding the truth in love is a mark of the true church, and such as forsake this are apostates. Such is the schism, faction, and apostacy of the present Church of Rome, 'that mother of idolatries, and of the abominations of the earth.' And Reformation is a most glorious thing, when founded upon its right basis of reason and Scripture, liberty and charity.

2. How strong an argument may what hath been said, afford us for the truth of the Christian religion; here was a most signal event foretold, and that many ages before it came to pass; an event, the like to which had never happened since the creation of the world, and most probably there never will happen such another; it was, therefore, an event which was out of the reach of all human conjecture or foresight, and yet experience hath shewn that the prediction was exact.

Neither enthusiasts nor impostors could possibly have guessed so agreeably to so uncommon an event. Nor can we, who have lived to see so much of the accomplishment, describe this apostacy in a more just or lively manner than St. Paul has here done in a few verses, and St. John more largely in the Revelation.

They, therefore, must have been true prophets and divinely inspired, or else they never could have uttered such remarkable predictions, which time and fact have so amazingly verified.

Some other arguments for the truth of the Christian religion, though just and conclusive, may be of a more subtle and difficult nature; but the rise and progress of this apostacy is a fact, a plain, notorious, well-known fact; an argument which cannot easily be evaded, but must strike the virtuous and attentive.

All church history, for several past centuries, is full of it; and we need only open our eyes and we may behold too much of it. For the Man of Sin is even now upon his throne, exalting himself as much as he can, above all the kings of the earth, and with such strong delusions seducing the nations, as to make many of them believe a lie. They may pretend among us that Popery is altered, and become a meek and harmless religion; and that they have thrown off that persecuting spirit which they have formerly discovered. But how lately have we heard of the dismal effects of their cruel and tyrannical temper, and the poor banished Saltzburghers, whom it is the glory of this Protestant nation so generously to have relieved, are too fresh an instance and proof of the persecuting spirit of Popery to suffer it to be believed among us, that the Church of Rome, though dressed up in sheep's clothing, is any other than a ravenous wolf.

Our ancestors felt the dreadful effects of their persecuting spirit, and experienced their tender mercies to

be cruel. Nay, we ourselves were in imminent danger; but by a remarkable interposition of the divine providence, the snare was broken and we have escaped. Yet all pious and benevolent persons are daily mourning over this antichristian corruption and tyranny; and ready to say, "How long, O Lord, holy, just, and true, wilt not thou deliver thine elect, that cry unto thee day and night."

Christianity is a religion reasonable in itself, promotes the purest virtue, was at first planted by miracles, and great plenty of spiritual gifts. And here is a remarkable prophecy, which after so many hundred years, is exactly verified by a notorious event. What evidences would be sufficient where all these are rejected.

3. We ought not to be shocked at the present state of the Christian church. Because such did the apostles of our Lord prophecy, that it would be. Though the best of things are liable to corruption; yet one would hardly have thought it possible, that so great, so notorious a corruption, could, by any pretence have sprung out of the Christian religion. Look into the New Testament, which contains the religion of Jesus, and look into the polity and constitution of the Church of Rome, and you may easily perceive that light and darkness are not more unlike. The gospel every where requires the greatest virtue and purity, and this wicked church, which schismatically calls herself the Catholic and only true church, has invented so many arts to make men very religious, without any virtue or goodness at all; that wherever it is established and prevails, it encourages almost all manner of wickedness and abominations.

Daniel prophesied that the God of heaven would erect a kingdom, which should be subject to the Son of man; and we say, that this kingdom of righteous-

ness was actually erected by our Lord Jesus Christ. Now upon looking abroad into a great part of Christendom, it is natural to inquire, is this the kingdom prophesied of ?

No, to prevent the anxiety which might arise in the minds of true Christians from such a difficulty, it was also prophesied, that out of this spiritual kingdom should arise one of the greatest apostacies and corruptions that ever appeared in the world. Though true Christianity, as contained in the Scriptures, has all along been invariably the same.

4. How ought we to rejoice that this tyrannical and unrighteous power shall come to an end ! and think ourselves, obliged from a sense of our duty to God, and out of benevolence to mankind, to do every thing in our power towards bringing about so happy an event !

Blessed be God that we are delivered from this worse than Egyptian darkness and slavery. Particularly, let us reflect, with gratitude, upon our narrow escape under the auspicious conduct of the glorious Prince of Orange, King William of immortal memory, who, by the favour of a kind Providence, laid the foundation for a latter escape, when, by means of a persecuting and bigotted faction, a popish pretender was ready to ascend the throne. Then it was that King William's noble legacy took place, by the coming in of the illustrious house of Hanover ; a family, who were amongst the first protesters against popery, and who have ever since continued Protestants. And which hath been, in a distinguishing manner, the glory of that illustrious house ; and attended with the greatest and most diffusive blessings ; they have, upon many occasions, been strenuous assertors of liberty, both civil and religious.

Blessed be God for such a royal family, and let all the people say, Amen. May they and their descend-

ants continue friends to mankind throughout all coming generations ! and experience the joys and ample blessings which attend the sincere love of truth, virtue, religion, and liberty !

It is said that this corrupt and persecuting religion gains ground in this free and Protestant nation ; and even in this day of light and liberty. But what madness must possess such as would bring us back again into this spiritual Egypt ! when all wise men would avoid her, for fear of, at last, partaking in her plagues !

It is the duty of all Protestants to give up whatever absurd doctrines, or imposing principles, they may have hitherto mixed with what is truly reasonable and Christian. Till then it must be expected that popery will always get footing among us.

Thanks be to God that we have the Scriptures so common, and in our own language ; that we are allowed the liberty of private judgment ; and blessed with so many and such excellent helps to understand our Bible, that such a spirit of liberty and free inquiry hath, in this last age, gone out into the land ! May heaven diffuse this happy spirit, and grant it the longest continuance.

It is not three hundred years ago, since our ancestors were required to believe the grossest absurdities, and to practise the most flagrant idolatry, and that upon pain of forfeiting all that was dear to them in this world, and of being sentenced to eternal damnation in the next.

Though the first Reformers made a glorious stand, and went great lengths, in a little time, yet they could not shake off one of the worst parts of Popery, viz. the spirit of infallibility and persecution. And a race of tyrannical kings, supported by covetous and ambitious priests, continued to practise upon Protestants, that cruelty which all Protestants had so much and so

justly exclaimed against, when practised by the papists upon themselves. By this means it has come to pass, that true liberty and free inquiry are but of yesterday—a blessing reserved by providence for us.

The most acceptable way of testifying our gratitude to Almighty God, for so great, so unspeakable a blessing, is to study the Scriptures with care, and to form our temper and practice accordingly. To allow others that liberty of private judgment which we ourselves so ardently desire. To avoid uncharitableness towards such as differ from us, and to show our good will to the persons of the papists, whilst we so much and so justly abhor their religion. Let us ever take care to watch against a persecuting spirit, in all the branches and degrees of it; and to lay the great stress of religion, where the Scriptures of the New Testament have laid it, not in abstruse notions, and unintelligible subtleties: not in forms and ceremonies, nor in an empty profession of the purest and best religion; but upon the sincere love of God and one another, upon a due governing our passions and sensual appetites, and the habitual practice of universal holiness. For what signifieth it what church any man belongs to, what profession of religion he makes, or what advantages he enjoys, if he doth not love God and keep his commandments—if he abuses his liberty to licentiousness; and in the midst of such marvellous light, shows that he loves darkness, by leading a scandalous and wicked life; which, of all others, is the blackest heresy, and the most flagrant and most notorious corruption and apostasy.

THE END.

I N D E X.

- ABSTINENCE**, monkish, condemned, 8
 ——— from meats, 8, 39, 442
- Adoration of the Cross**, 119, 177, 179, 281
 ——— a poetical license, 119
 ——— Host, gross idolatry, 131, 145, 146, 281
 ——— Pope, 28, 34
 ——— Virgin, 178
- Antichrist**, 195—287, 36, 41, 44, 51, 69, 82, 92, 110, 158
 (No. 55,) 166, 338, 377, 417, 428, 432, 441, 458, 464
 ——— a tyrannical, idolatrous, and blasphemous power,
 206, 207, 208, 461
 ——— reign of, to be computed not from his birth, but
 his coming to maturity, 460
 ——— duration of his reign, 459, 460
 ——— will appear when Christian pastors are careless,
 227
 ——— is subtle and cunning, deceiving the learned and
 the wise, 228
 ——— conceals his enormities under a veil, 231, 269,
 276, 277, 284
 ——— counterfeits an angel of light, and mingles lies
 with Divine truth, 228
 ——— and Christ contrasted, 234
 ——— have no fellowship, 205, 263, 264
 ——— applied to the bishop or church of Rome, 203
 ——— applicable only to papal Rome, and absurdity of
 every other interpretation, 35, 216
 ——— weakness of Grotius's treatise concerning, 215,
 317, 466, 467

- Antichrist, inexcusable conduct of those who make light of the prophecies concerning, 202, 274
 ——— blindness and infatuation of those who contend he is not come, 217
 ——— will not be converted but destroyed, 233, 286, 461
- Apostasy, 1—53, 58 note, 60, 62, 131, 134, 238, 239, 243, 266, 286, 293, 297, 323, 324, 338, 343, 345, 383, 417, 441, 449, 464—486
 ——— in what it consists, 5, 6, 27
 ——— does not necessarily involve a formal abjuration of Christianity, 9, 27
 ——— associated with idolatry, 5, 9, 26 (No. 8,) 31, 48 (No. 22,) 74
 ——— of Rome, not of comparatively modern date, 33
 ——— Church of England charges the Church of Rome with, 34
- Apostolical Succession, 343, 359, 420, 437, 438 note, 439
 ——— in what it consists, 437
 ——— by lineal descent only, a worthless dogma, 359, 440
- Atonement the, virtually rejected by the Church of Rome, 360, 368, 431
 ——— set aside by purgatory, 349
- Babylon, 46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 162, 200, 201, 206, 214, 235, 252, 253, 260, 268, 282, 287, 337, 414
- Barrow, Dr. Isaac, 438, 439
- Beamish, Rev. H. H. 379
- Benson, Dr. George, 464
- Bible the, interpreted by our own reason, the religion of Protestants, 393
- Blasphemy of the Church of Rome, 12, 18, 19, 24, 29, 36, 66, 95, 111, 124, 127, 130, 153, 159, 208, 211, 224, 283, 308
- Bradford, John, 264, 265
- Bridges, Rev. C. 325
- British Review, 407
- Browne, Archdeacon, 319
- Bull, Bishop, 132, 274, 322
- Burgess, Bishop, 135, 253, 254, 308
- Burkitt, Rev. William, 24, 173, 174, 271, 302, 408
- Burnet, Bishop, 99, 101, 103, 104, 284, 296, 317, 326
- Butler, Mr. Charles, 265, 370
- Calvin, 172, 249
- Cecil, Rev. R. 377
- Celibacy, 8, 39, 231, 266, 442, 452

Chalmers, Dr. 186

Chillingworth, Bishop, 393

Christ, the only Mediator between God and man, 132, 297, 299, 303, 360

—— the only Saviour, or no Saviour at all, 247, 297 note

—— the only true foundation, 370, 415

—— effectually renounced by Papists, 248

—— and Antichrist contrasted, 234

—— have no fellowship, 205, 263, 264

Christendom, idolatrous state of for many centuries, 112

Christian, the real, complete in Christ, 360

—— Guardian, 157, 370

—— Observer, 49, 253, 254, 268, 382

Church, the being of, lies in essentials, 311, 401, 439

—— name of abused, 231

—— at one period not to be discovered in the collective body of nominal Christians, 304

—— of Rome, see Romish Church

Church the true, in what it consists, 315

—— the essentials of are faith and worship, 439, 440

—— what constitutes a test of, 329, 349, 440, 481

—— what constitutes a member of, 292, 298

—— where to be found in the 8th century, 93

—— nice distinctions respecting, 318

—— contrasted with the Church of Rome, 315, 370, 383, 402

—— forced to flee into the wilderness, 26 note, 30, 93, 460

Church of England, exempt from all suspicion of idolatry, 113

—— her principles and practice sometimes at variance, 317

—— differs in fundamentals from the church of Rome, 132, 306, 309, 312, 314, 360

—— charges the church of Rome with apostasy and idolatry, 34, 102, 103

—— denounces the religion of the church of Rome as ungodly and counterfeit, 316, 317

—— virtually excommunicates the church of Rome, 325

—— Magazine, 252, 265, 406

Claggett, Dr. 327

Common sense, importance of exercising, 122

Cooke, Dr. 325, 408

- Cooper, Rev. Edward, 47, 51
 Corruption of human nature, 72, 322
 Cowper, William, 14
 Cranmer, Archbishop, 263, 381
 Credulity, evils of, 156, 387, 403
 Croly, Rev. G. 64, 69, 411, 412
 Cross, adoration of, 119, 177, 179, 281
 Cuninghame, Mr. 43, 159, 160
- Daubeny, Dr. 49
 Davenant, Bishop, 131, 299, 317, 319
 Dead the, worship of, absurd and impious, 8, 453
 Declaration against Popery made by the British Sovereign, 187
 Divinity, fashions in, 215, 216
 Doctrine, remarks on, 20, 69, 132, 309, 313, 315, 319, 331, 343, 344, 349, 359, 381, 394, 401, 425, 440, 471, 480, 485
 ——— the true touchstone of a church, 290, 359, 440
 Doddridge, Dr. 273
- Edgar, Samuel, 51
 Essays on Romanism, 188
 ——— the Church, 35
 Eucharist, sacrament of, essentially violated by withholding the cup, 131
- Faber, Rev. G. S. 26, 27, 29, 186, 415
 Fathers, primitive, degree of deference due to, 392
 ——— their opinion of image worship, 100, 183
- Faussett, Dr. 43, 45, 63
 Fell, Bishop, 216
 Finch, Mr. 381, 404
 Fletcher, Rev. Joseph, 421
 Forbidding to marry. See CELIBACY
 Fundamentals of Christianity, not held by the church of Rome. See ROMISH CHURCH
- Gilpin, Bernard, 174, 253
 Gordon, Mr. 187
 Graves, Dr. 58
 Gregory I. pronounces him the forerunner of Antichrist, who assumes the title of Universal Bishop, 196, 213
 Gregory II. the first Pope, 79
 Grotius, 317, 466
 ——— pernicious effect of his treatise concerning Antichrist, 215
 Gunpowder treason, 294

- Hall, Bishop, 254, 255, 311
 Hammond, Dr., 466
 Hancock, Rev. Wm., 426
 Harlot a, the type of an apostate Church, 26, 31
 Henderson, Rev. J., 287
 Henry, Matthew, 300
 Hobson, Rev. S., 160, 320
 Holding the Head, see Romish Church
 Homily against Idolatry, 113
 ——— on Obedience, 256
 ——— on Good works, 317
 ——— for Whitsunday, 258, 316
 Hooker, 268
 Hooper, Bishop, 264, 381
 Horne, Rev. Thos. H., 48
 Horsley, Bishop, 158
 Host, see adoration of
 Howley, Archbishop, 254
 Human merit, 248, 250, 402
 ——— opposes the all-sufficiency of Christ's righteousness, 402
 Humility, voluntary, condemned, 302
 Hurd, Bishop, 99, 209, 317, 393

 Idolatry, 57—191, 34, 43, 44, 48, 207, 208, 238, 279, 281, 284, 300, 301, 302, 351, 353, 360, 379, 397, 402, 418, 442, 462
 ——— spiritual whoredom, 26, 280
 ——— a heinous and damnable sin, 300, 352
 ——— the sin of sins, 68
 ——— the great comprehensive sin of popery, 163
 ——— intensely hated by God, 57, 58 note, 59, 60, 66, 73, 74, 106, 112, 160, 162, 168, 173
 ——— divorces a church from Christ, 58, 92, 112, 239
 ——— ought not to be tolerated or connived at, 59, 108, 148, 149, 150
 ——— rise and progress of, in Christendom, 69, 94
 ——— similarity between pagan and papal, 61, 157 (No. 54,) 158 (No. 55,) 162, 282, 283, 386, 93 note.
 ——— awful judgments denounced against, 58 note, 107
 ——— and Christianity, incompatible, 58 note, 67, 75, 100, 103, 108, 109, 158 (No. 56,) 166
 ——— constitutes apostasy, 9, 48 (No. 22,) 58, 62, 74
 ——— blasphemous, of the Church of Rome, 207, 211
 ——— Romish, not merely a human error grafted upon a divine religion, 166
 ——— Romish, a mystery of iniquity, 149
 ——— nothing more antichristian, 253

- Idolatry, Homily against, 113**
 ——— condemned by a council, 84, 120, 158
 ——— its natural effects are impurity and impiety, 67, 165
 ——— increases as spiritual knowledge decays, 76, 77
 ——— chargeable on any church that addresses another mediator besides Christ, 94, 99
 ——— marks the genius of Antichrist, 269
 ——— superstition and apostasy should be called by their right names, 134
- Idolaters, excluded from the kingdom of heaven, 103, 107, 160 (No. 59)**
 ——— Romish, surpass the Gentiles in folly and wickedness, 99, 102, 110, 146, 147
 ——— effrontery of, 7, 111, 135, 136, 144, 151, 155, 165, 285, 433, 471
 ——— less worthy to be trusted than any idolaters, 150
 ——— danger of communicating with, 147, 300
 ——— vengeance denounced against, 462
 ——— regarded by the Church of England as the greatest of all idolaters, 110
- Idolatrous Christian Church, the phrase contradictory, 58**
- Images, literally worshipped in the Church of Rome, 65, 80**
 note, 81 note, 93 note, 102, 109, 112, 119, 120, 126, 136, 143, 145, 178, 179, 190 (No. 73,) 384
 ——— use of, condemned by the early fathers, 100
 ——— bowing down to, expressly forbidden, 143
- Image worship, 402, 403**
 ——— opinion of early writers respecting, 100, 183
 ——— introduced and supported by the Popes, 158
 ——— deceit and falsehood, necessary accompaniments of 169, 171
 ——— expressly prohibited in Scripture, 78, 181
- Indulgences, Popish, 421, 350, 472**
 ——— an insult to God, and a fraud upon man, 403
- Infallibility, Romish, 50, 402**
- Intention of the Priests, absurd opinions respecting, 146, 155, 403, 434**
- Inquisition, 242, 295, 304, 411**
 ——— an infernal engine of persecution, 412, 473
- Invocation of the Virgin, 115, 127, 133, 163, 402, 471**
 ——— Saints and Angels, 6, 9, 97, 115, 124, 126, 133, 172, 176, 361
- Jewell, Bishop 23, 215, 233, 236, 322**
- Jesuits, 406, 473**
- Justification by faith, 48, 74, 76, 305, 332, 348, 369 (No. 164)**
 ——— clearly taught by the Reformers, 249

Justification by faith, the surest defence against clerical encroachments, 78, 89
 ————— the predominant precept of Christianity, 305

Keith, Rev. A. 25

King, Mr. 59

Language, precision of, importance of attending to, 319

Latimer, Bishop, 263, 381

Lathbury, Rev. T. 350

Lawson, Rev. J. P. 358

Laud, Archbishop, 254, 358

————— objected to Bishop Hall's calling the Pope Antichrist, 254

Leighton, Archbishop, 373, 375

Leslie, 324

Liberality, a spurious, confounds right and wrong, 251

Lloyd, Bishop, 327

Lowth, 256

Luther, 204, 249, 369, 382, 408

Lynde, Sir H. 113

Macknight, Dr. 291

Magee, Archbishop, 370

M'Gavin, Mr. 169

M'Ghee, Rev. R. J. 49, 274, 328, 369, 383, 414, 420

M'Neile, Rev. H. 416

Mant, Bishop, 106, 311, 313

Mant and D'Oyly's Bible, 247

Marsh, Bishop, 310

Mass, idolatry of, 281, 284

————— opposes the all-sufficiency of Christ's atonement, 285, 403, 415

————— the sacrifice of, enriches the Romish church, 404

Maynooth College, 413

Mede, Mr. 4, 27, 215, 414, 459

Melvill, Rev. H. 50, 333, 335, 359

Milner, Rev. Joseph, 94, 270, 304, 305, 378

Misopapisticus, 324

Miracles, pretended of the Church of Rome, 25, 39, 47, 110, 153, 252, 256 (No. 93,) 267, 275, 353, 355, 371, 385, 445, 468, 469, 479

Monkish abstinence condemned, 8, 39

"Mother of God," an impious title applied to the Virgin, 65

Newman, Rev. J. H. 65

Newton, Sir Isaac, 414

Newton, Bishop, 8, 13, 27, 218, 299, 414, 440, 463

——— Rev. John, 41

Noel, Hon. and Rev. B. W. 323

Orders, monastic, 244, 373, 385

Ordination, Christian, 344, 358, 359

——— in what it consists, 341

Oxford Tract Writers, 43, 49, 62, 393, 438

——— palliate the errors of Popery, 43

O'Sullivan, Dr. 329

Palmer, Rev. W. calls the Church of Rome part of the
Church of Christ, 32, 34, 438

Pantin, Rev. T. P. 317

Papal and Christian Churches contrasted, 370

——— and Pagan Idolatry, similarity between, 157, 158,
162, 360

Payne, Dr. 404

Persecution, a distinguishing character of apostate Rome,
173, 241, 473

Philpot, 265

Phillipotts, Dr. (Bishop of Exeter) 169, 172, 321

Pope, the, Antichrist, 69, 79, 82, 92, 198, 200, 201, 203,
214, 235, 256, 257, 260, 263, 266, 267, 285, 390

——— the man of sin, and son of perdition, 10, 25, 27,
36, 198, 214, 235, 263, 267, 443, 454, 472, 482

——— assumes divine titles and attributes, 11, 13, 25, 28,
29, 34, 36, 37, 47, 240, 243, 262, 267, 388,
390, 443, 475

——— a secular prince, 83, 86, 92, 407, 461, 476

——— adoration of, 28, 34, 443

——— atrocious wickedness of, 29, 33, 389, 438, 445,
472, 478

——— a tyrant, usurper, and promoter of sedition, 37,
47, 92, 109, 134, 437, 438, 475

——— his likeness accurately drawn, 13, 38, 48, 211, 440,
453

——— his power clearly foretold, 441

——— his pretended vicegerency, treason against Christ,
267, 284, 403

——— conspired against Catholicism, and fell into heresy,
50

——— the supporter of image-worship, 158

——— not the successor of St. Peter, 236, 374, 437

——— does not teach Christian doctrine, 437

——— is *ipso facto* destitute of office and authority in
the Christian church, 438

Popedom, the beginning of, 69

- Popery, a prodigious structure of imposture and wickedness, 373, 390
- a monstrous system of iniquity and soul-murder, 371
 - a system of error and corruption glossed over with outward forms of decency, 398
 - the enslaver and curse of mankind, 371
 - the master-piece of Satan, 45, 377
 - Satan's grand scheme for opposing the Gospel, 377
 - the great enemy of Christianity, 35, 252, 262, 280, 480
 - neutralizes Christianity, 284
 - a totally distinct religion from Christianity, 26 note, 166, 251, 259, 261, 305, 383, 428, 483, 484
 - the great corruption of Christianity, 440, 464
 - incompatible with Christianity, 264, 305
 - not a modification of Christianity, 250, 428
 - an absurd modification of heathenism, 409, 428, 432, 471
 - its fundamental principles identical with nominal Christianity, 166
 - its grand object to extort money, 435, 436
 - its character unchanged, 482
 - encouragement of, a national sin deserving national chastisement, 44, 46, 186
 - the seeds of, sown in the Apostles' times, 12, 13, 40, 268, 478
 - of gradual growth, 45
 - the religion of corrupt human nature, 426
 - the corruptions of, particularly foretold in Scripture, 440, 462, 482
 - declaration of the Sovereign against, 187
 - persecuting character of, 10, 173 (No. 65,) 241
 - blasphemously usurps the place of God, 398 note
 - the true bane of Ireland, 398
 - a religion without a Saviour, 432
 - and Protestantism contrasted, 305, 307, 311, 370
 - admit of no coalition, 305
 - a great gulph fixed between, 321
 - many Protestants ignorant of its real character, 165
 - Bishop Van Mildert's opinion of, 44
 - Archbishop Howley's opinion of, 254
- Pope's rival, 50
- Pride and self-righteousness, evil consequences of, 71, 74, 299, 302
- Private judgment, right of, 863, 370, 391, 402, 471, 485, 486
- Protestant, the 53, 169, 237, 246, 252, 309, 409, 429, 436
- Protestants believe both Christ and Antichrist are come, 217

- Protestants, should abandon absurd doctrine, 485
 ————— not sufficiently on their guard against the crafty
 designs of Papists, vii, 306, 308, 405
 ————— criminal negligence of, in reference to Papists,
 417
- Purgatory, 231, 349, 403, 429, 432, 436, 479
- Romish Church, Antichristian character of, see Antichrist.
 ————— Apostasy of, see Apostasy.
 ————— Idolatry of, see Idolatry.
 • ————— does not hold the Head, 291—305, 6, 82
 note, 92, 95, 316, 335, 340
 ————— does not retain the fundamentals of
 Christianity, 306—314, 132, 166, 254
 (No. 89,) 274, 276, 348, 361 note, 347,
 350
 ————— not a true church, 315—361, 103, 250, 304,
 305 note, 317 note, 481
 ————— not an integral portion of the Church of
 • Christ, 26 note, 32, 304, 321—329, 341,
 103, 250
 ————— chargeable with the grossest idolatry, 10,
 105, 131, 138, 145, 162, 167, 168, 316,
 360, 379, 384
 ————— leaves out the Second Commandment, 120,
 135, 144, 167, 280
 ————— worships many gods, 132, 384, 386
 ————— authoritatively enjoins the worship of
 saints, &c. 7, 9, 94, 97, 101, 126, 127, 132
 ————— pays more honour to the Virgin and the
 Saints than to Christ, 9, 60, 117, 127, 130,
 132, 163, 188, 189, 283, 297, 393, 423.
 471, 475
 ————— denies the exclusive Mediatorship of Christ,
 9, 63, 94, 132
 ————— anathematizes all who pray to God alone
 through Christ, 118, 125
 ————— the enemy of Christ, 252, 262, 268
 ————— not the spouse of Christ, 295, 337
 ————— has departed from Christ the Head, 292
 ————— has departed from the true Christian wor-
 ship, 9, 311, 314
 ————— does not believe in Christ as he is revealed
 in the Bible, 360
 ————— constructed upon a denial of the funda-
 mentals of Christianity, 361
 ————— does not belong to the visible Church of
 Christ, 31, 52, 339

- Romish Church, does not worship the Trinity, 188
-
- turns admissions in her favour to the best account, 336
-
- the Apocalyptic Beast, 159, 174, 265, 267, 277, 334, 364, 377
-
- the mystic Babylon of the Apocalypse, 32, 46, 53, 147, 162, 200, 201, 268, 287, 304, 337, 359, 379, 414, 472
-
- the apocalyptic harlot, 186
-
- the Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, 46, 149, 150, 337, 364, 441, 472, 481
-
- A mystery of iniquity, 284, 383, 376, 407
-
- the seat of Satan, 52, 198, 260, 275
-
- the synagogue of Satan, 350, 381, 342
-
- blasphemy of, 12, 19, 24, 29, 36, 66, 111, 124, 127, 130, 153, 159, 308, 342, 385, 390, 411
-
- persecuting character of, 10, 173 (No. 65,) 241, 293, 294, 473, 482
-
- usurpation of, 37, 39, 134, 441
-
- secularity of, 406
-
- diabolical character of, vi. 428
-
- a false church, vi. 34, 354, 378, 335
-
- a fallen church, 396
-
- a faction, 364, 366
-
- a foreign monarchy grasping at universal dominion, 325, 327, 329. 407
-
- too corrupt to deserve the name of a Christian church, 304, 309, 346
-
- the corruptions of, the natural offspring of the human passions, 407, 426
-
- a den of thieves, &c. 17, 322
-
- applies to saints and angels as Saviours, 97, 132, 297
-
- imposture and wickedness of, 7, 39, 45, 153, 356, 371, 385, 410, 444, 480
-
- blind superstition of, 134, 416, 423
-
- frauds and forgeries of, 39, 271, 353, 371, 372, 444, 154, 384, 480
-
- its falsehood and villany demonstrated by pretended miracles, 39, 354, 355, 372, 385
-
- rejects revelation and reason, 369
-
- magnifies the importance of ritual observances, but neglects personal religion, 420
-
- speaks lies in hypocrisy, 6, 7
-
- destroys the essentials of Christianity, 311, 331, 432

- Romish Church,** denies the atonement, 360, 368, 431
 _____ denies Christian doctrine, 394 note
 _____ vitiates the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 131
 _____ subverts the law of God, 241, 382
 _____ substitutes external forms for spiritual religion, 47, 296, 421, 470
 _____ struggles for the ascendancy, 405
 _____ appeals from Scripture to the Fathers, 363
 _____ exalts tradition above the word of God, 382
 _____ deserves to be censured in strong terms 371, 373, 376, 378, 379, 380, 382
 _____ schismatical, 399, 481, 483, 362, 364
 _____ not built upon the foundation of the apostles, 315, 362
 _____ will not be converted but destroyed, 24, 32, 174, 233, 245, 286, 335, 377, 456, 461
 _____ awful judgments denounced against, 32, 46, 58 note
 _____ the peculiar object of Divine indignation, 46
 _____ how described in the word of God, 337, 394
 _____ decision of the Great Head of the Church concerning, 345
 _____ lords it over God's heritage, 449
 _____ the destroyer of the souls of men, 428
 _____ in pretence Christian, but in reality Antichristian, 52, 206, 207, 441
 _____ counterfeits Christianity, vi. 168, 237, 238, 260, 263, 268, 317, 378, 476
 _____ charged with Antichristianism by the whole Protestant world, 202
 _____ its name ought to be changed from Apostolic to Antichristian, 52, 260
 _____ has forfeited all claim to the title of Catholic, 320, 321, 350
 _____ a corrupt community, vii. 309
 _____ a cruel and tyrannical church, 474
 _____ a tyrannical, idolatrous, and blasphemous power, 441
 _____ no more a true church than an adulterous woman is a true wife, 476
 _____ hates the Bible, 278, 349, 408, 409, 415, 480
 _____ virtually rejects the Bible, 348
 _____ reasons for separating from, 99, 292, 311 (No. 131,) 313, 320
 _____ teaches the doctrine of equivocation and lying, 169, 271, 445

- Romish Church, its religion ungodly and counterfeit, 316
 ——— its religion idolatrous and superstitious, 134, 418
 ——— encourages wickedness, 483
 ——— has reformed nothing, 46, 150, 234, 482
 ——— quibbling conduct of, in reference to idolatry, 175 (No. 66,) 208
 ——— Archbishop Wake's opinion, of 171
 ——— resembles a Wolf in Sheep's clothing, vi. 482
 Roman Faith, diametrically opposed to Scripture, 313, 483
 Romanism, Essays on, 188, 190
 Romanists, reject the Bible as a rule of faith, 348
 ——— cannot be saved if true to their own church, 379. 412, 413
 ——— acknowledge themselves gross idolaters if Transubstantiation be not true, 105, 146
 ——— schismatics for departing from the true church, 293, 362, 364
 ——— unwittingly confirm the truth of Christianity, 462
 ——— effectually renounce Christ, 248, 274 (No. 113)
 ——— distort and disguise the truth, 321
 ——— danger of communicating with, in their false and idolatrous worship, 147
 Romish Priests, hypocrisy of, 8
 ——— the pests of human society, 237
 ——— the successors of the Scribes and Pharisees, 448
 ——— profligate ambition and wickedness of, 387, 407, 473
 ——— well skilled in the arts of sophistry, 122, 372
 Record, the, 59, 264, 335, 348
 Reformation, the, gratitude due for, 395, 425
 Reformers, the, dreaded incurring the imputation of schism, 206
 ——— believed the Pope to be Antichrist, 215
 Ridley, Bishop, 261, 381
 Schism, 204, 206, 293, 325, 362, 364, 367, 399, 401, 481
 Scholefield, Professor, 45
 Schoolmen, nice distinctions of, 284
 Scotch Confession, 266
 Scott, Rev. Thos., 38, 40, 57, 158, 252, 303, 377
 Scripture, the sole rule of faith, 369, 390
 Secker, Abp., 124
 Separation, does not necessarily involve schism, 325, 401
 Sherlock, Dean, 440
 Sins venial, and mortal, 430
 Skelton, Rev. P., 356

- Southey, Dr., 373, 390
 Stewart, Rev. J. H., 327
 Stillingfleet, Bishop, 402
 St. Januarius's blood, liquifaction of, 25, 479
 Stowell, Rev. Hugh, 376
 Supererogation, works of, 338, 421
 Superstition, 134, 416, 423

 Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 191, 275
 Thelwall, Rev. A. S., 378
 Tillotson, Abp., 157
 Townsend, Rev. G., 266, 314, 371
 Tradition, 298, 299, 323, 362, 381, 383
 Transubstantiation, 110, 131, 132, 264, 285, 360, 387, 403, 438
 ————— contrary to Scripture and reason, 123, 151
 ————— the great burning article of the Church of Rome, 154, 255, 360
 ————— a millstone hung about the neck of Popery, 156, 438

 Unction, extreme, 427
 Union, ecclesiastical, 204
 Unity of the church, 346, 368
 Universality of the church, 286, 367
 Usher, Abp., 29, 136, 151, 266, 267, 301, 368
 Usurpation of the Chnrch of Rome, 37, 39, 134

 Vance, Rev., W. F., 363
 Van Mildert, Bishop, 44
 Vaughan, Dr., 253
 Virgin Mary, more honour paid to than to Christ, see Ro-
 mish Church
 ————— invocation of, see Invocation
 ————— adoration and prayers offered to, 18, 59, 66 note, 115, 117, 127, 128, 133, 136, 160, 162, 163, 167, 178, 179, 188, 351, 386
 ————— called the Queen of Heaven, 18, 115, 130, 161, 189
 ————— the Mother of God, 65, 178
 ————— the great Mediatrix, 18, 129, 189, 386
 Wake, Abp., 171, 311
 Waldenses, the, 242, 293, 304, 347, 473
 Warburton, Bishop, 246
 Whately, Dr., 408
 Whitby, Dr. 48, 468

Wickliffe, 253

———— the morning star of the Reformation, 424

Wilberforce, Mr., 398

Wilson, Rev. D. (Bishop) 60, 333, 398

Worship of the dead, absurd and impious, 8

Xavier, Francis, saying of, 406

PRINTED BY
L. AND G. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.



Digitized by Google

